

ia





THE PULPIT AND THE PRESS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, price 2s. 6d.

THE RETURN TO THE FATHER.

Seven Sermons on the Prodigal Son.

With a Preface by the Rev. J. W. HORSLEY.

In Preparation.

“THE PECULIUM.”

With a Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR.

, Ex Libris
C. K. OGDEN
THE

PULPIT AND THE PRESS

AND OTHER SERMONS

*MOST OF WHICH WERE PREACHED AT S. NICHOLAS
COLE ABBEY*

BY
THOMAS HANCOCK

London
S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.
47 GREAT RUSSELL STREET & 78 NEW BOND STREET

1904

BX
5133
H3P8

PREFACE



ONLY a few people heard these sermons when they were preached, and a few more read them in the pages of the *Church Reformer*.

The Guild of St. Matthew now offers them for the study of all who are interested in the history of the teaching Church during the last quarter of the nineteenth century ; and for the guidance of those who are called to teach in the future. The former will, I think, place Thomas Hancock by the side of Frederick Maurice. The latter will, I hope, catch from him an inspiration not to be forgotten.

The few footnotes were added by Mr. Hancock when the sermons appeared in the *Church Reformer*.

STEWART D. HEADLAM,
Warden, G.S.M.

May, 1904.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

CONTENTS



	PAGE
THE PULPIT AND THE PRESS	I
THE WORSHIP OF MAMMON	8
THE SOCIAL CARCASE AND THE ANTI-SOCIAL VULTURES .	15
THE HYMN OF THE UNIVERSAL SOCIAL REVOLUTION	22
THE BANNER OF CHRIST IN THE HANDS OF THE "SOCIALISTS"	31
THE POOR ARE GOD'S ELECT AND THE WORLD'S CREDITORS	41
RIGHT, AS JUSTICE, AND AS CHARITY	48
THE INDISSOLUBLE UNION BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND THE NATIONS	56
THE RELIGION OF THE STATE REQUIRES THE THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH.	67
THE CHURCH AND THE PUBLIC-HOUSE: OR, TEMPERANCE NOT TO BE USED AS A CLOAK OF MALICIOUSNESS .	75
A FEW OF THE THINGS WHICH "CLERGYMEN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND" HAVE SAID ABOUT LAND- LORDISM AND ROBBERY	82
THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PENTECOST	92
CHRIST UNITING HIS CHURCH TO THE STATE, AND ENDOWING HIS CLERGY	102

	PAGE
BREAD: THE GIFT OF GOD TO THE WHOLE NATION	113
THE APOSTOLIC FUND IS NOT SILVER AND GOLD BUT THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST OF NAZARETH	122
JESUS CHRIST THE SUPREME RITUALIST	130
THE SIGHT OF GOD THE SOURCE OF ENDURANCE UNDER WRONG	140
THE CHURCH AND THE COMMONWEALTH AS NATIONAL EDUCATORS	148
THE COMMON SALVATION AND SCHEMES OF SALVATION	161
THE HEAVEN FROM WHENCE WE EXPECT THE SAVIOUR OF OUR BODY	172
JESUS OVERCOMING THE TEMPTATION TO POPULARITY	185
LABOUR DAY AND THE RED FLAG	200
THE CHURCH AND THE CIVIL SCHOOL	212
THE NATIONS' APOSTLE AND OTHER APOSTLES	221
PRIESTS AND POLITICAL PARTIES	233
THE LENTEN FAST	240
ARCHBISHOP LAUD, THE MARTYR FOR RELIGIOUS EQUALITY	250
ST. PAUL'S POLITICAL COUNSEL TO THE ROMAN CHURCH	266
THE DISENDOWMENT OF THE SAVIOUR	275
MY DUTY TOWARDS MY NEIGHBOUR	286

THE PULPIT AND THE PRESS¹

“The disciple is not above his master : but every one that is perfect shall be as his master.”—ST. LUKE vi. 40.

WE associate two ideas with the word master ; they are kindred, but yet distinct. One is government ; the other is education. By government a master rules those who are under him ; by education he trains those who are under him to self-rule, to liberty, to equality. Both ideas are united in the Lord’s two sayings, “The disciple is not above his master”—that is to say, he is his inferior : “but every one that is perfected shall be as his master”—that is to say, he will be a faulty disciple if he does not become his master’s equal.

The relationship of teacher and taught, employer and employed, master and disciple—though its present conditions are so unequal—has its primary root in the equality of all men before God. It only reaches its highest ideal end, and is only “perfect,” as the Lord says—when this equality is completely realised. A bad master wishes to keep back some of his knowledge, craft, and culture from his scholars ; he is fearful, not eager, that his disciples should learn all that he has to teach, rise fully to his level, end by becoming his equals. A good master, on the contrary, is much more fearful lest his disciples should not rise to his level, should not apprehend in its entirety what doctrine he has to teach,

¹ Fourth Sunday after Trinity, 1884.

should not attain to equality with himself, should not become "perfect," which is, as the Lord says, to become as their master. The true master leads his disciples to the Master of masters, in the beautiful spirit of that ideal master, St. John the Baptist, who said, "He must increase, but I must decrease." Jesus Christ dares—as the Only Begotten Son could alone dare—to assert that even the Master of the Universe desires that we sinful men and women should actually become *His* equals. Does this sound like a paradox? The paradox is in the astonishing words of Jesus Christ, "Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect," or, as in the parallel words in St. Matthew, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful."

Both the ideas which we connect with a perfect master—the Lord and Ruler, and the Educator, Liberator, Equaliser—are realised in Jesus Christ. He is the Lord of all: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth." He is the Teacher of all. "He is the True Light who is enlightening every man who comes into the world." That He is the Liberator of all, men imply every time they use the words "Our Saviour." That He is the Equaliser of all is evident in the ever-recurring undertone of His Sermon on the Mount: "That ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven." He, the Son of God, gives this lesson to the disciples and the people because He is eager that they and we all should be what exactly He is.

We can hardly decide whether our Lord originally spoke these words as a lesson for us as masters, or as a lesson for us as disciples. Every man is both a master and a disciple. We all teach, we all are taught. If we connect them with the words which follow, we must conclude that they were spoken most directly to

masters, teachers, rulers, employers. "If the blind lead the blind." A man who professes to clear his scholar's, subject's, or servant's sight or insight—to take the mote out of his brother's eye—must first of all assure himself that *he* has clear sight and insight, that there is no beam in his own eye. For every teacher but one, Jesus Himself, some confession of blindness is necessary; and by such a confession the master or teacher equalises himself with the taught, or acknowledges their common equality before God, and so does what he can to rid himself of the danger of being a "blind leader of the blind." This is a confession which we do not ever hear from those who give themselves out as the infallible and clear-sighted guides of the blind.

The world is full of such guides. But by far the most pretentious and noisy of these, and the most readily accepted by blind or lazy men who want to find a swift and easy road to right and truth, are the political or ecclesiastical party-leaders and their disciples, the political or ecclesiastical journalists, who have certainly become perfect as their masters. Has any man ever yet heard a political party guide of either colour, or a journalistic "best possible instructor" confess that he had a beam in his own eye? What an edifying spectacle the disciples of these "best possible instructors" would have had a few weeks ago if they watched their masters, the guild of conductors of the great daily journals, who want to take the beam out of our eyes, roaming about after a new sort of conjuror, called a thought-reader!

I was hinting last Sunday that the teaching of the whole and full doctrine needed for social as well as individual salvation is likely, by the grace and goodness of God, to be thrown again upon the pulpit, because the newspapers dare not fully handle such questions as those

by which the poor and unrepresented are now mainly perplexed. A great daily paper can only be produced by enormous expenditure. Thus the keys of the treasury by which a big journal lives are in Mammon's hands; they are not the keys at the right hand of the Father, where the Son of Man is sitting. They are not the keys which Christ Jesus gave to St. Peter, and with which the apostle opened the doors of the universal-human Church equally to the Jews and the nations. A great newspaper dares not say what will displease Mammon; it dares not even give a full chronicle of the merest news or facts, if they should be news or facts which Mammon wishes to keep unknown, lest Mammon should stop the supply by which alone a great journal can be kept alive. I am not speaking of what are called bad newspapers, the publicans of the press, but of what are held to be irreproachably respectable newspapers—the very Scribes and Pharisees of the press. Do they not want nearly all their space for the chronicling of the latest doings of the world, the flesh, and the devil? What fitter title than “blind leaders of the blind” can we find for newspapers which give two columns of the “latest betting,” which allow “a sporting prophet”—the characteristic modern prophet of Mammon—to hint to one of his blind disciples the readiest way of cheating another of his blind disciples out of his money, perhaps his life, than the title which the Lord has provided, “blind leaders of the blind”? It may be said that if gambling, adultery, robbery, murder, and other crimes are going on, it is right that we should know it. Well, but why are the newspapers so silent about the social sources of these and other crimes? Why do they say nothing, or so very little, about the appropriation of the common land, the common school, the common church, by the rich and

powerful? We must turn to their sermons, to their leading articles, which, as the "We" who compile them so often tell us, are thought to be so superior to the priest's sermon in the Church. Go behind this pretentious and infallible "We." What do you find? A "blind guide"—the hired spokesman of a political or religious party, perhaps a Pharisee, perhaps a Sadducee; perhaps a Tory, perhaps a Liberal; the Pharisees and the Sadducees, the Tories and the Liberals, hate one another, but neither hates the other half so bitterly as each hates the Son of Man, the Liberator of men from the cruel prison of party. It matters little what political rosette the blind guide wears; his business on earth is always the same, and for any leading which the blind guide gives to his blind disciple he might just as well wear the one as the other. It is the function of this master to show his blind disciples that his party is always in the right, even when it does that which is wrong, and that the opposite party is always in the wrong, even when it does that which is righteous and good. The Church will soon have a war in the Name of the Father of all men, the Redeemer of all men, and the Inspirer of all men against these tyrants, these blind guides. So long as they are honestly newspapers, as they honestly record what is going on in the Commonwealth, they are doing God and men good service. But when they pretend to be our infallible guides and masters, and abuse the facts of the day or hour into texts upon which they preach their hyperdogmatic and ephemeral lectures, they become blind leaders of the blind. We priests, whom God has constituted absolvers of humanity, the looseners of men from their chains, are bound to tell the blind, as our Master did, that their leaders are blind.

Do you ask why? The only perfect Master and Leader has given you the reason. The conditions of

true insight are (1) humility as to oneself, and (2) charity as to all others. "Cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye." The man who is always posturing as "We," as right in everything which he writes, can hardly be humble. "A beam in *Our* eye!" A man whose business it is day by day to convict all orators and writers of the opposite party as wrongdoers and injurers of the Commonwealth can scarcely have much charity. Charity would never do for a party leader or for the editor of a party journal, for Charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, believeth all things, hopeth all things. This blind guide may be full of honesty and charity as a private man; but as a teacher he is obliged by the demands of his strange function to be puffed up, and to be always at enmity, to affect an infallibility which he knows is not his, to feign a hatred which he does not feel.

I will tell you why I think the poor priest in the pulpit, if he is faithful to his function, is likely to be a surer guide than the influential editor who assumes to be the guide of half a nation, or than the clique of capitalists who are his masters. The Pharisee's nature, the blind nature, is in us as in them. But we have to *own* it. Our teaching is bound to be preceded by a humiliation of ourselves. If the journalistic Pharisee thanks God—and when he guides a religious journal, he does this ostentatiously—it is because he is "not like other men." He glories in the inequality which raises him high above them. A confession he never makes. How could he? It would be contrary to his function. But his profession, if it were formulated, would probably run thus: "We have never erred, nor strayed from the right

way. Our paper, our party has never left undone those things which it ought to have done. We have never done anything which we ought not to have done. There is no health in any party, in any paper but ours. Have mercy upon those miserable offenders who are not always in the right, as we are."

The teacher whom Jesus sends does not ascend the pulpit until he has knelt on the same level with the disciples as a fellow-wrongdoer. When he descends from the pulpit he kneels on the same floor with the disciples before the altar. Think what the priest equally with the people, the teacher equally with the disciple, the leader equally with the led, has to say in the Confession at Matins and Evensong, in the Confession before the Eucharist. In what the newspaper-teacher would call "the sacerdotal system" there is such a confession of the equality of all men before the Father as you do not find elsewhere; whatever affectation of superiority the devil may suggest to us while we are preaching, God compels us officially to renounce it when we have ceased preaching. Then we say: Guides and teachers though we are by our calling, we too, like those whom we lead, "have erred and strayed from Thy ways and have followed too much the devices and desires of our hearts. We have done those things which we ought not to have done: we have left undone those things which we ought to have done: and there is no health in us."

THE WORSHIP OF MAMMON¹

IN the great battle of human life on earth, social and individual, the two forces ultimately opposed are good and evil. To be Christ's soldier in this contest is the service to which each of us was pledged in baptism. But what is good and what is evil? If we substitute for good and evil God and the devil, or divide evil into three chief agencies—the devil, the world, and the flesh—we still have to seek for definitions. The Son of God, in the very beginning of His ministry, when proclaiming the laws of the kingdom of God and indicating the processes by which alone the will of God can be done and His kingdom can come on earth, cleared the question when He declared God and mammon to be the ultimately rival claimants for the possession of each of God's creatures, individual and social—man, family, parish, and nation. "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." The name God, as uttered by the co-eternal Word, does not stand as a mere synonym for the ultimate Reality. It does not merely declare, as our Teutonic word God does, that the ultimately real is and must be the absolutely good. Jesus means by God the One with whom men and women "have to do" and to whom they are related

¹ From a Lenten sermon (Oxhey Church, March, 1885).

in as real a kinship as there is between parent and child. God, He tells us, is the Father. "Your Father in heaven" is the text and the ever-recurring burden of the Son's Sermon on the Mount. Therefore, when Jesus said, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon," He said to His hearers then and to us, You are the sons and daughters of God. Since you are the children of God you cannot serve the Father and mammon. If you would live in yourselves, your families, your parishes, your nation, your humanity, as what you really are, the children of God, as brothers and sisters, you must refuse to serve mammon, to honour mammon as a master; nay, you must be fighting against mammon as the chief foe of the Father of mankind.

God is the Father—that is clear. This is the gospel, the joyful message from the eternal unseen, which the Word of God brought to the Jews, and brings by the Church to the English. God is the Father not only of Jesus, but of all mankind. Jesus has united Himself to every member of the human family by His Incarnation, by becoming Man. The apostle of the nations expresses this by calling Jesus the "second Adam." Therefore, when God looks on men and women, He sees none of those secular differences which mammon makes. He sees no kings, no subjects; no nobleman, no peasants; no philosophers, no fools; no capitalists, no labourers; no rich, no poor. The Divine and all-equalising look of the common Father sees in men and women only His children. The sole distinction which the Father sees in humanity is the distinction between goodness and badness. He sees sons and daughters who are really filial, brotherly, sisterly; these are the godly—that is, like to God their Father in the person of Jesus Christ, their elder Brother. He sees sons and daughters who are unfilial, unbrotherly, unsisterly; these are the

ungodly, the estranged, the prodigal children of the Father, and the whole work of God on earth by His Son and His Spirit, and by His Church, has as its end the reconciliation of the unfilial and unbrotherly ones to their Father and to their brethren.

But who or what is this rival of the Father, this chief foe of God's human family? What is Mammon? The Son of God used a Chaldaean word which all His hearers understood. St. Jerome says that it was used in the same sense in Syriac, and St. Augustine says¹ that it had the same meaning in his time in Punic. But if the Lord were to appear among us, and speak to the English instead of the Jews, what must He say to mean the same thing? What English word would He take, in our age, as the most fit and complete possible modern personification of the worst enemy of God and of humanity? The English for mammon, when our version was translated, would have been "wealth" or "riches." The English for mammon, in our present condition of social development, is "capital." We might say "fortune"; but fortune may be either good or ill, may stand for great gain or great loss; it is not sufficiently precise and exact to stand as the living equivalent for what Jesus meant by "mammon." What the Son of God and Son of Man, the Judge of every creature, says to us Englishmen is this: "Ye cannot serve God and capital."

Christ had "emptied Himself" of all to come into the world as its Saviour; He knew no way of making all men and women rich but by making Himself poor. The word with which He puts Himself afresh in contact with us at the font of baptism is, "Renounce." Wealth and gifts, as the Giver views them, are not any private

¹ "Lucrum punice *mammon* dicitur." Cp. the English word lucrative—that is, "Mammonish."

man's own. They are always *common* property in the Father's view, lent to the one to use for the profit of all. "Having food and raiment," says the apostle, "let us be therewith content." "Take heed and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance (or superfluity) of things which he possesseth." Life does not subsist on superfluity, but on what is necessary. "True it is," says Richard Hooker, "that the kingdom of God must be the first thing in our desires; but inasmuch as a righteous life presupposes life, inasmuch as to live virtuously it is impossible unless we live: therefore the first impediment which naturally we endeavour to remove is penury and want of things without which we cannot live." You who are contented that you have enough should be actively discontented, as there is one man in the world who has less than enough. And beware of greed. Jesus, the knight and champion of the Father and of mankind against mammon, strikes at all the forms of mammon-worship which men justify and praise—the greed of the fortune-hunter, the mere self-helper, the man who "gets on" by getting others off—as well as at all the forms of it which men condemn. The teaching of the Head and Emancipator of our race has been justified by the historical experience of all nations, and now that the civilised world is becoming crowded more thickly with the hungry, naked, homeless, hopeless workers with no work, the forgotten social doctrine of the Lord is coming forth with a fresh confirmation. The richer that the rich become and the poorer the poor, the faster the nation develops into the likeness of the Apocalyptic Babylon, which is contrary to the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of God and of mankind, the more multitudinous is the poverty, nakedness, and moral degradation of thousands of its inhabitants. Wherever there is superfluity there want and starvation are its

inevitable fellows. In London, the richest city in the world, one person out of nine dies in a workhouse. As the Son of God could only save mankind by becoming poor, so if any young Christian is determined to follow Christ and be a saviour in his degree, he must make up his mind never to spend an instant in seeking to be rich. We want a guild for those who are tempted to serve mammon, which, for the sake of God and humanity, will pledge its members to do in our age, and under our conditions, what Francis of Assissi and Dominic did for Western Christendom in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by saving it from apostacy. He is the true patriot who will bravely declare, "For the Father's sake, for the sake of my fellow-men, for dear England's sake, I will not seek to be a rich man." What do I say?—he "must" and "will." Why, if he is a Christian, if he has been baptized, he has already declared it. The obligation *is* upon us, it is recorded in our Christian name. We have one and all taken a sacramental oath that we will never aim at making a fortune; we have one and all pledged ourselves to God that we will "renounce," not that we will "gain" and "grab." A Christian who deliberately makes it the purpose of his life to "make a fortune," or "serve mammon," as Christ calls it, to pull down his barns and build greater, and there bestow all his goods, to heap up a capital—is already breaking the vow and promise which he made to God in his baptism. You *cannot* serve God and mammon. Jesus tells us by His parable that the struggle to get more than enough, the perversion of life into a hunt for a fortune, is more than socially hurtful. It not only degrades Sion into a Babylon, turns the city which God constructed for men into a habitation of devils, but it perverts the individual life of a man from its noble end. The rich man in the

parable was the ideal man of the Babylonish world ; he did what parents advise their sons to do. If he had lived in our days he would have been knighted or put into the House of Lords. When God had said to him, "Thou fool!" and he had died, his biography would have been written and given away to boys as a school prize ; his native town would have raised his statue with acclamations. But God said to him, as God still says to such men by fever, or bankruptcy, or a scapegrace son, or burglars, or terror of death, "Thou fool!" The rich man had two ends in life. He was not like the miser who has only one end. His first end was to make money, to serve mammon, to exploit the labour of his needy brothers and sisters in building up for himself a splendid temple of capital. But he had a further end. When the temple of mammon was built he meant to take his rest in it—"I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years ; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry." It was not his sin against God and mankind that he meant to make a bad use of wealth when he had it. Idle enjoyment of wealth created by others, gluttony, drunkenness, and luxury are sins ; but this man did not live long enough to sin after this sort ; he was too much occupied with the sin of covetousness and fortune-making. But suppose this rich fool had said, "What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my profits ? I will pull down my factories and build greater, and there I will earn a hundredfold increase of my profits. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast countless thousands well laid out and bringing in magnificent interest ; take thine ease, build hospitals, endow churches, support charities for the poor and naked brothers and sisters by whose labour thou has made thyself rich." To him also God must say, "Thou fool !" He had sinned all along ;

as St. Basil puts it, "He has been a spoliator by using God's gifts to all, as if they were his own property." Or, as St. Bernard says, "God had all along been saying to him through the groans and murmurings of the hungry and unemployed, We have earned in cold and want what thou storest up. What profit to us, whose labour has created their value, are all thy exchanges, the extension of thy fields, the things folded up in thy baggages? Ours is that which thou consumest; from us thou hast cruelly withdrawn that which thou spendest in vanity. Yet we are the handiwork of God, we are redeemed with Christ's blood. We, therefore, are your brothers . . . Everything which adds to your vanities is drawn from our necessities."

It is as illegal in the kingdom of God to aim at heaping up capital in order to be a pious philanthropist, as it is to aim at heaping up capital in order to be a luxurious epicurean, or a patron of art and culture. It is not the ulterior end, it is the primary end of such a life, the perversion of individual life into an anti-Christian and anti-social calculation how to make a fortune, which the Saviour of mankind condemns; because no man can live this sort of life except by serving mammon, and to serve mammon is to insult the Father and wrong the family of God, which is mankind, and to stifle that which is of God in individual life.

THE SOCIAL CARCASS AND THE ANTI-SOCIAL VULTURES

“For as the lightning cometh out of the East, and shineth even unto the West : so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.”—ST. MART. xxiv. 27, 28.

WE have seen this week in our city, and in other places of our nation, what may be called the “coming of the lightning out of the East,” and its glaring, terrifying, destructive “Epiphany¹ unto the West.” In ancient Jerusalem, indeed, the East, the seat of the sunrise, was the symbol of hope and new life to man and the world. In the capital of our Western island, “the East” has become a symbol of misery and despair. It is the lair of the underpaid work, and the want of work, whose direct children crime and destruction are. In “the East” is generating the anti-social force by which those whom God made to be men and women are being dehumanised into the vulture. If we English people, like the people of Jerusalem, refuse to be gathered together by the Son of Man—united rich to poor, educated to ignorant, as one family of equal brothers and sisters in Him—our day of judgment, the end of our world, the consummation of our age, cannot long be delayed. Unless England repents, and rises out of her moral and social death, the Son of Man must appear and let loose “the vultures”

¹ “Shineth (*phainetai*) even unto the West.”

by whose dreadful ministry He will destroy the carcase of a corrupt and putrid civilisation.

The Son of Man, as the Judge of the privileged and as the Avenger and Knight of the unprivileged, called His Apostles, and through His Apostolic Church now calls the conscience and the nations to mark the two awful social phenomena which are more or less present in every form of so-called civilisation. It is probable that he cited a proverb which had long been in circulation, one of which He, as the Eternal Word, was the original suggester, and which is to be found under some variation in the daily speech of every people.¹ As in the physical world, so in the social and spiritual world, we see "the eagles" ("vultures" is a better rendering of the original), and we see "the carcase." If the social "carcase" were not lying in Jerusalem, or in London, or in Leicester, or in Birmingham, defiling God's pure air with its vile putrescence, there would be no gathering of the "vultures."

What, then, is "the carcase"? It is the corrupt and false society, not solidly built up and compacted upon the foundation which the Father of all has laid for each—the common and equal brotherhood, the duty of all to work, and to live by their work: but puffed up on the treacherous and unreal foundations of privilege, interest, class, caste, or party, which pervert brethren and sisters into enemies and competitors. The one legitimate object and end of society is that which the Head and Bond of all fellowship in heaven and earth is indicating to conscience and the nations, by sending His Church into all the world with the Sacrament of Baptism. The end and reason of society is the presenting of every man perfect in Christ Jesus. No human creature can

¹ Grotius speaks of Latin adages with similar meaning, and quotes—"What vulture's prey will this corpse be?"

develop into a vulture, a creature of prey and destruction, if he receives that which God by the Sacrament of Baptism is continually declaring to be the property of the very lowest and grossest on the earth—first, an education and nurture as the dear child of the Most High; secondly, the duties and rights of a free man in the government of the Kingdom of His Son. The “carcase” is a national society, such as Jesus saw in elect and privileged Jewry, proud and vauntful of its commercial development and of its religious vitality, but really “dead in (social) trespasses and sins”—a body from which the grieved Spirit of God, the Lord and Life-giver, has departed.

It is the tendency of the old Adam in us, contrary to the call of our new Adam, Christ Jesus, to look first at the anti-social “vultures,” and only afterwards, or not at all, at the social “carcase.” Whenever the forestar of the Day of Judgment is in the social heavens, when the lightning from the East glares upon the vile corrupted social carcase in the West, we shall hear urgent cries all around us, as the Son of Man said we should, “Lo, here is the Christ! or there! For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets”—optimist statisticians and lying political economists, dextrous statemongers and solicitors-general to Mammon—“who shall show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect.” They will speak to us from the editorial chairs of the newspapers, from the platforms of public meetings for the protection of the interests of Mammon and the few against the demands of the Father of all. What will be their Gospel, their new commandment, their counsel of perfection? We are hearing it already, “Shoot the vultures!”

It is a crafty counsel, such as we might expect from the synagogue of Satan. If we can but shoot or cage

all "the vultures" which get within our range we shall certainly save the God-offending carcase for a little time longer. But the Son of Man in this parable does not lay the stress upon the destructive force of "the vultures," nor upon their multitudinous "gathering together"—their mobbing—but upon the existence of so horrible a thing as the social corpse, which stinks in the nostrils of the Father, and which must inevitably gather together, to devour and pillage it, these ministers of His vengeance. "The vultures" are the men and women, the boys and girls, the thieves and prostitutes, whom by its cruel and selfish use or neglect of them, while it was still inhabited by the Spirit of Life, the society perverted out of humanity into vulturehood.

No sane man denies—not the wildest revolutionist who dreams that the heavenly Jerusalem can be built up in London or New York in five minutes—that thieves, rioters, and looters ought to be caged on the spot, and severely punished. The Christ of God is not like the Vice-Christ in the Vatican. He grants no indulgences to transgressors, poor or rich. Poverty and hunger, like superabundance of wealth and fulness of bread, are temptations, and behind each form of temptation lurks the devil. Jesus is the Forgiver of all our sins, and our Rescuer from all our temptations, and for those very reasons He is the Punisher of the very least sin. Every boy who throws a stone at a club-window or steals a ring out of a jeweller's shop is urged by the devil to the deed, and he is told by the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of the Judge within him, at the moment he is doing it, that he has no right to do it.¹ But a

¹ How far he may justify those who are really maddened by their hunger, or the hunger of their children, in taking bread, I do not say: but we are bound sometimes to read in Church what He said to the Pharisees and Sadducees of His age. (St. Luke vi. 3, 4.)

coarse thief who steals because he will not work is just as truly a sinner against the Father and against the brethren as a man who is devoting all his time and his gifts to exploiting the hard work of his brothers and sisters, in order to make a fortune for himself. The deliberate thief, quite as much as the deliberate fortune-hunter, or as the pocketter of a gambling-bet, is taking something which the Father has not made his. The same Judge and King who says outwardly and inwardly, by His social laws and by His Spirit, to the plutocrats, "Woe unto you that are rich, for you have received your consolation," says, to all fortune-hunters, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth," says also to every poor boy and girl, "Thou shalt not steal."

It can be no question, therefore, with the Christian, or with any honest man, whether the rioting and looting of "the vultures" ought to be condoned and left unpunished. We need no prophet of the newspapers to tell us that it is wicked to smash and pillage. The point of the parable of our approaching Judge is that the destructively wicked, as the Psalmist puts it, are the sword of God, and that He suffers one form of wickedness to rage against another form of wickedness and become its punishment. But the Lord, in His instruction of His Church, goes much farther than this. He tells His apostles, and through them all His clergy in all ages and nations, that they are to regard the one form of wickedness as the inevitable product of the other. It is the doctrine of Christ that the social producer of evil, that which He calls "the carcase," is fundamentally more horrible and anti-social than the evil social product—that which he calls "the vultures." There could be no "vultures," or no "gathering together" of them to national destruction according

to Him who shall come to be London's Judge, unless the national society, as in religious and wealthy Jerusalem, had first of all become a "carcase." If a Babylonish civilisation produces such a brutalised kind of creatures as the pillagers and burglars, the procurers and prostitutes, it is to be expected that the creatures will act according to their kind. But it is less horrible that they should act according to their kind than that there should be a kind so to act.

In the Gospel of St. Luke, this saying of the Lord is introduced as a direct answer to a question of the apostles. They wanted to know when the end of the world, the consummation of the age, was to be, and on what spot the awful events of which He forewarned them were to take place. They said unto Him, "Where, Lord?" And He said unto them, "Wheresoever the body is, thither will the vultures be gathered together." That is to say, wheresoever men are adding territory to territory, field to field, and house to house, there society must at last be exposed to the fury of the landless and the houseless. Wherever men are building up fortune and reputation in the West upon the work of the underpaid and the half-starved in the East, there the lightnings of the Son of Man must come out of the hovels and garrets of the East, and scare and scorch the palaces of the West. It always has been so; it always must be: if we go on building up a Babylon instead of a Sion, what else can we expect?

Let us leave it to that other Minister of God who "bears not the sword in vain," to deal with the ravaging of "the vultures." Christ calls upon His clergy and laity to direct all their thinking and acting to the saving of society from becoming a putrid "carcase," which must of necessity gather together "vultures." It is our function to recall the conscience and the nation to the

forgotten and least fashionable portions of the doctrine of Jesus, the whole of which are needed for the true end of society—the presenting of every man perfect in Christ Jesus. We have to confront the wealthy and the wealth-seeker with those texts in the New Testament which they must wish could be proved to be false readings, the texts which are never posted upon the walls, the texts which are never chosen as the titles of tracts, the texts which are rarely put at the head of sermons, unless it is to prove that Jesus does not mean what He says, the texts which make the heart of Lazarus leap and the heart of Dives fail: “Woe unto you that are rich”; “Blessed be ye poor”; “Go sell all that thou hast”—riches, power with men, learning, place, art, or whatever else God has given thee—and give it back to Him in His poor, “and come, take up thy Cross, and follow Me.” Who can do it? How shall we do it? Who can be sure that he is doing it?

THE HYMN OF THE UNIVERSAL SOCIAL REVOLUTION ¹

“He hath shewed strength with His arm; He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts; He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble and meek. He hath filled the hungry with good things; and the rich He hath sent empty away.”—ST. LUKE i. 51-53.

I THINK that this is a fair statement, in better words than I can formulate, of the hopes and the objects of the Guild of St. Matthew. We do not suppose that we can fulfil them; whatever strength we have comes from our faith that God has pledged Himself, by the birth of His Son into our flesh, to their fulfilment. You are familiar with the words. They broke forth from her who was at once the humblest and meekest of woman-kind and the Lady of our race, when she knew that the Christ was to be born, and that she was to be His Mother.

Every nation has what is called its national hymn, but the *Magnificat* is the hymn of all peoples. It is the hymn of humanity, the hymn of all parishes. In every local commune of the Western nations, where the wholesome customs of the Church are kept, this hymn is said or sung every afternoon. For at least twelve

¹ Sermon preached for the Guild of St. Matthew at St. Mary-the-Virgin, Crown Street, Soho, on the Sunday within the Octave of St. Matthew's Day, 1886.

hundred years this has been the practice of the Churches. The parishes or communes of Christendom—those old local, secular societies which become by baptism the congregations of the Church—are far older societies than the national Kingdoms and Republics; so this local parish hymn, the *Magnificat*, is much more ancient in its use than any of the so-called national hymns, such as “God save the Queen,” or “*Rufst du mein Vaterland!*” or the “*Marseillaise*.” It will outlive them all. For every so-called national hymn has war, competition, the murderous destruction or crippling of sister nations, as its actual or implied motive; while the *Magnificat* has as its motive the scattering, disappointment, and depression by God’s Son of those classes in every nation which make wars, which thrive by them, which stir up unbrotherly hatred and competition between people and people—those three castes whom Mary calls “the proud,” “the mighty,” and “the rich,” against whom the Everlasting Father, as He says by the incarnation of His Son, has declared war.

When the Church, evening after evening, in all her parishes, is saying this hymn, she is unconsciously foretelling—the most ignorant and prejudiced of her priests and people are foretelling—that greatest of all revolutions, which the Blessed Virgin saw to be involved in the birth and work of Him whom she carried in her womb. To Mary, at that awful moment of inspiration in which her lips poured forth this song of humanity, this *Marseillaise* of all the nations, was revealed the stupendous social and political reversal which the birth of the Son of God as the Son of Man, as the son of a poor carpenter’s wife, was bound sooner or later to produce in all the world. She stood at that moment upon the eternal ground where past and present and future are unknown, where our distinction called “time”

has no place : and therefore she spoke as if the far-off end of the Father for mankind were near and present, and already reached. She sings of the social revolution not as about to come down from heaven, and to occupy ages in the coming, but as having actually come. The *Magnificat* is the inspired summary of the tendency and direction of the future social history of the humankind. We are so used to this daily hymn—as we are to the air by which we live—that it is not easy for us without a special act of thought to realise the tremendous character of its contents, and its awful importance to all sorts and conditions of men and women in the daily ordering of their lives. In this afternoon hymn of the universal Church every parish is declaring, and professes to be joyfully proclaiming, what is the real end of God in His government of the nations ; how the Son of God is now actually using that supreme power which has been given to Him in heaven and in earth ; to what issue He that sitteth in the heavens is slowly but most surely developing all “ the imagination of the hearts ” of the Herods and the Pilates, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, the Cæsars and the mobs of every age and every place. “ We see not yet,” as the Apostle says, “ all things put under Him.” But we know by faith that “ He is showing strength with His arm, that He is scattering the proud in the imagination of their hearts ; that He is putting down the mighty from their seat ; that He is exalting the humble and meek ; that He is filling the hungry with good things, and that He is sending the rich empty away.”

The sword which went through Mary’s bosom, as she saw the apparent defeat of the Son of God upon the Cross, must in its degree go through ours also as “ we see not yet all things put under Him.” But all these things the arm of the Lord had already rehearsed in the

Egyptian revolution, with which the history of Mary's nation began, and wherein and whereby God revealed the law and the process of the social future. The rudimentary materials of Mary's song are historical and political; they are all to be found in outline in the song of Hannah at the birth of the last great prophet of the republican period of Israel, and in the national Psalter. God is the same in all generations. If He looked upon the children of Israel enslaved and cheated out of the fruits of their labour in the brickfields of "the proud," "the mighty," and "the rich" Egyptians, so He must have been regarding the homeless, the workless, and the hungry everywhere in Mary's day; so must He be regarding them in our day in London. Although they think that He has forgotten them, although it often seems to the lowly and the hungry as if God Himself were neglecting them, they are everywhere more the objects of His regard, more important to Him, than all "the proud," "the mighty," and "the rich." God is always and everywhere at war against these three classes—as the Church declares with joy every afternoon in this hymn—on behalf of the humble, the meek, and the hungry.

The poor think that no one is on their side, but if they have the faith of the carpenter's wife they will see that their cause is moving "the arm of the Lord." The object of the counsels of the Most High is the "scattering" of the clever plots and arrangements made by the proud statesmen and diplomatists of this world in the conceit of their hearts; the hurling down of dynasties, as St. Luke has it in the Greek, "from thrones," the confusion of imperialist schemes. The invisible armies of the incarnate Word of God are fighting on the side of those who are conquered and beaten on earth; the angelic almsgivers of the Father

are giving joys and pleasures to ragged children in narrow streets, and even a possession of the world which the idle rich and the fine lady would be glad to buy with thousands of pounds. A great lord "owns" a park; but he complains that he can never enjoy it, as some poor landscape painter does who perhaps has only a few pence in his pocket.

In the *Magnificat* we thank God for giving such alleviations to the humble, the meek, and the hungry. But the Song predicts, and it demands, for the millions of our kind, much more than alleviations. The proud, the mighty, and the rich—in Jewry, Heathendom, or in Christendom—have never yet realised the actual contents of the *Magnificat*. Have the faithful, the humble, the hungry ever yet realised them? No such revolutionary hymn, no such socialist song, has ever been sung by angry crowds, as that which is so quietly and unsuspectedly said or sung every afternoon in the thousands of Christian parishes. What is more wonderful is that it is said or sung daily by the proud, the mighty, and the rich themselves to their own condemnation. If there had not been a tacit assumption amongst us all that its words are not to be taken in their plain meaning, that it is the business of the clergy to spiritualise away its three terrible contrasts—the moral contrast, the political-social contrast, and the economical contrast—into meaning something distant and unreal, would not the police, in some lands at least, have prohibited such words from being publicly said or sung? "This carpenter's wife," they would say, "is exciting the parishes to revolution. Her so-called hymn is nothing less than a disguised socialist war-song; it is setting class against class; it implies that the three classes, whom she describes as the proud, the mighty, and the rich, are opposing themselves to God and

goodness, to the coming of the Father's Kingdom and the doing of His Will on earth. She does not utter one word in condemnation of the evident vices of the poor and the hungry. She speaks of the proud being scattered, the mighty put down from their seats, and the rich sent empty away ; she actually rejoices in the vision of this catastrophe of wholesale confiscation. She has not a word to say on behalf of the rights of property and class, or of a fair compensation. The bishops and clergy, if they would earn their pay and justify their social position, ought to point out the dangerous tendencies of these revolutionary stanzas. It would be a very fortunate thing for respectable society if some eminent critic could prove that it was spurious, or if some very early manuscript of the third Gospel could be discovered in which the *Magnificat* is wanting." Indeed, it is impossible to imagine anything more contrary to the sort of hymn which would proceed from the Virgin of Lourdes, or the Virgin of La Salette, or the Virgin of Marpingen, or the Virgin of Einsiedeln, or any other of those local Virgins to whose statues sound Conservatives and Reactionists all over Europe are now going on pilgrimage. A Pope has declared that the Blessed Virgin is the great foe of Socialism. If the *Magnificat* be her song, it would be far more reasonable to call her the Mother of it.

It is my object simply to ask you to look into this familiar hymn for yourselves. It would be impossible in a short sermon formally to expound its successive clauses. That which is called the spiritual exposition of it, its application to the private soul, is quite fit in its place, and will permanently remain a help and a light to the conscience—for the *Magnificat* is the hymn of every creature. But God is now calling His Church everywhere, as He called Moses, to consider before all

else the low estate of the desolate and oppressed, who do not now live as hermits, but in thick crowds. If all generations are to call Mary "Blessed," their ground for doing so must have some relation to the condition of their own generation. What has the *Magnificat* to say, or what are the parishes saying by it, to the men who tramp their native land from end to end and can find no work, to the men and women who in the richest city in the world can find no bed at night except on the seats by the riverside? It was for their sakes that the Only-Begotten Son of God was born of the Virgin Mary, and her hymn must have restored to it that predominantly *secular* meaning, that national meaning for each nation, which it certainly had as it broke forth from the lips of the daughter of Abraham and David. "The Lord remembering His mercy," said the patriotic Mary, "hath holpen His servant Israel; as He promised to our forefathers Abraham and His seed for ever." In her Son, in whom is neither Jew nor Greek, He has made the same promise to all the peoples. The Social Revolution—"the Restoration of all things" as the apostle calls it—which is now the articulate or the implicit expectation and hope of "the hungry" in every nation—which so many dream they can bring about by copying the inhuman methods of "the proud," "the mighty," and "the rich"—is presented to the heart and conscience in this hymn as the "promise of the Lord." Mary declared that Revolution, the parishes of Christendom in their daily afternoon hymn proclaim it, to be the very object for which the Son of God was made the Son of Man, the Champion and Rescuer of Humanity, in Mary's womb. Is He not revealing Himself in the history of the world, daily more and more clearly, as the real Head of Humanity, as the only possible Saviour not only of individual

souls, but of peoples? The great idea which runs throughout this afternoon hymn of all the Christian communes is the certainty of the restoration of the whole world after the Father's original plan, and the assurance that this reform is only possible by the judgment of Christ upon those whose whole business and object it is to thwart the plan of God for all His children—upon the proud, the mighty and the rich. It is God's method—as He had showed throughout the history of Israel, as He showed at last to the whole world in the mean birth of His Son, and in the election of His apostolate, to choose and use “the humble and meek” in spiritual character, those of “low estate” and in social standing, even the “hungry,” as the great instruments of His providence. “He hath exalted the humble and meek,” He is exalting them; He will exalt them. The theories of Society which are thought out by slaves under the lash of Egypt, by labourers sweating in the fields and workshops of the modern nations, and not those elaborated in the prudential councils of statesmen or by comfortable professors of plutocratic economy, are those which exhibit the fullest reflection of the Kingdom of God's Son, and which God has fore-ordained to prevail and to be realised. “He hath put down the mighty from their seats,” or, as the Evangelist of the Nations renders it in his Greek, “He hath deposed the dynasts from thrones.” Is not the Church praying for the prevalence and the realisation of the social theories of the “hungry” when she says, “Father, Thy Kingdom come; Thy Will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven; Give us this day our daily bread?” By “the hungry” whom could the Blessed Mother have meant except that part of society to which she and St. Joseph belonged, and to which the Lord of all was to belong—carpenters, and fishermen,

and those who worked daily for their bread? If you say she must have meant those who "hunger and thirst for righteousness," would not this Mother reply, "There is no 'righteousness' so long as there is any soul in a nation without a certainty of daily bread"? Would she not say, "There is no 'hunger for righteousness' where it is not the supreme care of the commune and the state that all may eat and be satisfied"? The "good things" with which she foresaw the Father had pledged Himself by the Incarnation of His Son to fill the hungry—literally the "possessions" or property ("*mit gütern*," as Luther has it)—must mean, as the contrast in the text demands, such things as we are fond of calling temporal and worldly. The gaining of a great fortune, or a high social position, may be called temporal or worldly in the unchristian sense; for such gains are a man's achievement for himself—possibly with the devil's and the world's help, and by the oppression or outstripping of his brothers and sisters. But "daily bread" is not temporal and worldly in this sense, as the whole of the Old Testament bears witness. It is the characteristic gift of the Eternal, and so the Church confesses by the central place which she is obliged to give it in her chief prayer—in the Lord's prayer. Yes, the *Magnificat* is a *Secularist* hymn; and its rich spiritual contents can only be fully disclosed in an age like our own to those who are caring, praying, and working for its secular fulfilment.

THE BANNER OF CHRIST IN THE HANDS OF THE "SOCIALISTS"

"In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an Ensign of the People. And He shall set up an Ensign for the Nations and shall assemble the outcasts."—ISA. xi. 10, 12.

I.

SOME years ago, before Johann Most was expelled from Germany, he attempted to persuade the German Socialists to what he called a "*Massenaustritt*"—a formal and deliberate exodus of the masses of the "desolate and oppressed"—from the fellowship of the Church. He dogmatically and pontifically declared, "Socialism shall not be Christian: all ye who would enter into the new perfect social order must first of all abandon Christ." Johann Most, if I err not, was educated as a Catholic. He knew, therefore, that entry into the Church is marked by a formal and personal act, such as the simplest of our kind can understand. He thought that a schism of the exploited men and women from the Society of the Son of Man, and their incorporation in the new Socialist society, had become a duty. He concluded that the departure of men out of the Church ought to be marked by some act as formal and personal as that by which they had entered it. Most's conception—allowing for the utter unlikeness of the *Zeitgeist* which ruled the seventeenth century to that by which the nineteenth century is

ruled—was akin to that of the early German Anabaptists and English Quakers. They also were moved by their horror at the moral apostasy of the Church, at its complacent substitution of the precepts of Mammon for the commandments of the Father, to call upon all who hungered and thirsted for righteousness to “renounce” that Baptism which they had received from the false and anti-Christian Church, and to enter by a new baptism—with water, as the Anabaptists said; without water, as the Quakers said—into a wholly new and more promising Church. I have no inclination to condemn them. Christ sent them to condemn us, and to call us to repentance. We see in our own age how easy it is for straightforward men, when they observe how the Church and the clergy are penetrated through and through with worldliness—how they reject, persecute, exclude from the full proof of their ministry the “prophets and wise men and scribes” whom “the Wisdom of God” never ceases to “send unto” them—to hurry to the conclusion that the Catholic Church, or a National Church, or a Parochial Church, can be nothing better than one of the provinces of that “whole world” that “lieth in wickedness.” It is easy for a just man to imagine that the priests, quite as truly as the so-called “patrons” to whom they owe the exercise of their ministry, are nothing but creatures of “the world,” its historical products and its present servants. As I do not feel any call to condemn the Anabaptists and Quakers, neither do I feel any freedom to rail after the fashion of a journalist or a mammonist at that extravagant action of Johann Most. The Apostle of the Nations has taught us to look first inside the community of the elect people for the cause of that which is ungodly, anti-Christian, outside the Church. “The Name of God,” he said to that apostate common-

wealth of which he nevertheless thanked God he was himself a member—"is blasphemed among the nations through you." If the Church has become apostate and anti-Christian—and who can dare to deny that it has?—the remedy is not a schismatic *Austritt*, as Novations, Donatists, Anabaptists, Quakers, Most's Socialists, Secularists, and others whom the Eternal Word of God in successive ages has inspired with a Christian ideal, have imagined. The remedy, as the Church of every nation and commune is now confessing by the keeping of another Lent, is to be found in the repentance and amendment of the Church itself. "The time is come," as the Apostle Peter said, "that judgment must begin at the house of God."

II.

The Church and clergy of England, and particularly of London, have just been called, by Christ's providence as Ruler of the Nations, to witness among ourselves a spectacle the very contrary to that which Johann Most attempted to produce in Germany. Week after week lately, instead of a "*Massenaustritt*," we have seen an astonishing "*Masseneintritt*." The non-church-going "masses" have taken to churchgoing. We have seen what journalists of Mammon and Caste call an "invasion of the Churches" by the poor Socialists. We have seen nothing else like it in our generation. "This is the Lord's doing; and it is marvellous in our eyes."¹

¹ It is exactly a hundred years ago, in 1787, that King George the Third issued a proclamation "requiring and commanding all our loving subjects, of what quality or degree soever, and every of them, decently and reverently to attend the worship of God on the Lord's day, on pain of our highest displeasure, and of being proceeded against, with the utmost rigour that may be, by Law."

For fifty years the National Bishops and the patron-made clergy—the pastors who have been chosen for the “masses” by Mammon and Caste—have been at their wits’ end how to persuade the crowds of the disinherited and oppressed to become, or own themselves to be, members incorporate of Christ’s Church. They have spent millions of pounds, they have held thousands upon thousands of anxious discussions for the solution of the pressing question—“How are we clergy to get the masses?” I can only repeat, what I have perhaps said often enough, that they are beginning at the wrong end: that it is the will of God that the so-called masses should “get” the clergy. So far as concerns the National Bishops, and in a less degree all those clergy who are appointed by the State, Commonwealth, or Fatherland, they are *indirectly* “got” by the masses, at least by so many amongst them as are freemen, are citizens, possess votes. By becoming voters they have become, in their place and degree, factors of the Government, electors of the Government; and thus they indirectly, through their Government, nominate to the bishoprics. But the parochial clergy, the pastors of the local communes, do not even possess as legitimate and as Christian a foundation for their position as that which can be claimed by the parish Churchwardens. The parish Churchwardens are the elect of the people, Church, or congregation: they are the men chosen for office by “the masses”: they stand on exactly as secure a ground, in point of popular authority, as St. Stephen or St. Philip did. They have been placed where they are, as St. Stephen and St. Philip were, by “the multitude of the disciples.” The rector or vicar, on the contrary, has not been placed where he is by “the multitude of the disciples”—by “the masses” as we now talk. He has been placed there by some

individual lord of land, some individual owner of money, or by some caucus of trustees who want to confine the Universal Church of all ages and all persons within the narrow bounds of some party which represents the prejudices, ignorances, and negligences of one particular age or class. The assistant clergy—who in really civilised States and parishes are freely elected by “the masses”—in our semi-civilised England are dismissible wage-servants of the patron-imposed incumbent. Unless they are careful to offend neither Caste nor Mammon—the feudal and the commercial exploiters of the one common Church—they usually find themselves, when they have arrived at middle-age, excluded by these two allied Antichrists from any further exercise of the ministry which they have received of the Lord. No power but that of “the multitude of the disciples,”—nothing but an extension of the so-called “invasion of the Church by the masses” from the material to the spiritual or social Church—can restore to Jesus Christ the service and ministry of which He is now being robbed by Caste and Mammon. The poor priests of the Lord ought to look to the poor alone, to the masses of the common people, to “the multitudes of the disciples,” to liberate His Church “from the patronage and control”—not “of the State” or sacred Fatherland, as the plutocratic Liberationists say—but from the patronage and control of anti-Christian Caste and Mammon. “The mighty” and “the rich” of the *Magnificat*, by getting the officering of all the local congregations of Christ into the grasp of landlords and money lords have not only despoiled every local people of their highest spiritual rights and obligations, but by substituting “patronage” for free election they have perverted the very tribune of the people, the local representative of Jesus Christ the

Redeemer—the parish priest—into a creature and a representative of class and “property.”

The “masses” know, or are beginning now in the Father’s good providence to know, not merely what it is to be robbed, but that they have been and are being robbed. They are beginning to learn that they have been thrust off the common land: the “commons” of the local commonwealths have been perverted into sporting preserves for Caste, or into “eligible building estates” for Mammon. They are beginning to learn that the free common schools have been appropriated to the sole profit of the same two Antichrists. But they have yet to learn the last and most momentous lesson of all—that Caste “the mighty” and Mammon “the rich” have successively expropriated “the multitude of the disciples,” or “the masses,” or “the common people” of that which is God’s appointed witness to their rights in the land and the school. Caste and Mammon have made the Church and its priesthood their own. The mighty and the rich have carried away Sion itself into captivity in Babylon. If “the masses”—the carpenters, the fishermen, the rate-collectors, the tent-makers—had retained the common Church and her ministry, which the Son of Man entrusted to their keeping, in which His apostles declared them to be rightful freemen or electors, it would have been impossible for them to be robbed of the common land or of the common school. If “the whole multitude of the disciples,” the masses, the common people, will but reassert their claims and place in the universal Spiritual Society, in the common Church of all the peoples, then the common land and the common school must infallibly return to that whole humanity to which the Lord gave the one and for which He instituted the other. The Church is His permanent spiritual and social witness—to “all nations” by the

apostolic or episcopal order, to every local parish or commune by its own freely-elected priest—that the earth hath He given to the children of men, and not to the caste of *Raubritter* or *Raubadel*, robber-nobles or robber-knights, which in “the times of ignorance” degraded Christ’s freemen into its own slaves or villeins. The bishops and priests of the common Spiritual Society are God’s witnesses that “every man that cometh into the world” is the subject of His own inward enlightening and educating Word, and therefore an inheritor by divine right of the school.

III.

I am quite aware that some will object, “Do you then call the organised mob of Socialists who thronged into St. Paul’s Cathedral on Sunday a “multitude of the disciples”? I will not stay to indicate in detail the signs of discontent, murmuring, and quarrelling which the apostles saw in those “masses” in Jerusalem, whom *they* nevertheless included within “the multitude of the disciples.” A “disciple,” I need scarcely tell you, is a learner. A disciple is one who adopts the maxims and laws of another as the only full and complete expression of his own belief and his own duties. It is very hard indeed to conceive of the minority whom the journalists call “the respectable churchgoers”—who regard the church-going of the Socialists as an invasion of their own private spiritual and ecclesiastical preserve, who think that the proper use of St. Paul’s Cathedral is to provide gratuitous concerts and entertaining sermons for the well-to-do—as “disciples” of Jesus Christ. The very first lesson which Jesus teaches every “disciple” who enters into His school is the ungodliness and inhumanity of the attempt to be rich. I need not quote texts. You

know them all. Although you will not find them in the publications of the Tract Societies which Caste and Mammon maintain for the "conversion" of the masses, and although you will never see them exposed upon the walls of a railway station, you can easily find them in a New Testament, or you may read them on the banners of the Socialists.

If some old Athenian philosopher had risen from the dead, or some Mohammedan, ignorant of the words of Christ and His apostles, had come into the streets of London on Sunday and watched the great multitude surging into St. Paul's Cathedral, they would naturally have asked, "Whose disciples are all these men? What leader do they follow? From whom do they derive the axioms and rules which are moving them?"

Have you, my brethren, looked at the banners of this "mob"? Have you observed "whose image and super-scription" they bear? It is not Cæsar's, not Victoria's, not Gladstone's, not Schnadhorst's, not Hyndman's.

You see that they carry banners with mottoes upon them. Who is *the author* of those texts which express the social faith of this huge multitude? From what teacher have they borrowed the dogmas which they call upon all the city to read and to respect, to observe and to obey? On whose authority are these innumerable crowds of the poor and rough doing this unwonted thing? They, or a great many of them, call themselves "Socialists." Let us read what is on their banners; let us discover *who* is the ultimate dogmatist of this multitudinous sect.

Christians, as you watch the mighty multitude pass by, you will soon be shaken out of many of your hasty *à priori* conjectures. Do you expect to read upon their banners wild words of their own invention? Do you expect extracts from Babeuf or from Proudhon, or even

from Ferdinand Lassalle or Karl Marx? Are not the "Socialists" their disciples? Ought not the mottoes by which they declare before the world their convictions, their demands, their faith, to be extracted from *Das Kapital* or from the *Arbeiterprogramm*? Oh, come, all ye faithful! Look again and again at these inscriptions. Recognise, while you have time, what they are: see, clergy and laity, out of whose mouth the cries of "the mob" have come. They are the words of *your* Master. They are the laws of the Eternal Father. They are the lessons which He taught us by His Son. They are the new commandments which you and I were pledged at our baptism to keep. "Feed *My* lambs!" "*My* house is a house of prayer, but ye (capitalists and landlords) have made it a den of thieves!" "*I* was an hungred, and ye gave *Me* no meat; naked, and ye clothed *Me* not." It is a small matter to what sect or party this great "multitude" fancies it belongs, or by what denomination it pleases to call itself. You can see to *whom* they have felt obliged to go in order to find the fullest expression of their faith. "In the name of our God," said the crowds of the London poor, as well as the Hebrew psalmist, "we will set up our banners." We have not seen in our generation any other such warning, or any other such an acknowledgment, that Jesus Christ the crucified is He whom the Father has exalted to be the Head of Humanity, to lift up an ensign for the peoples, to be the one and only all-sufficient mediator, representative, spokesman, and avenger of "all that are desolate and oppressed." This "sign of the Son of Man" is all the more amazing because it is so unintentional.

What is all the after-dinner talk at the tables of Caste and Mammon, or all the unmoral and unsocial wordspinning of Christian Evidence companies, over the

possibility of reconciling Darwinism and "Christianity" compared with that evidence which the Son of Man Himself sets before the corrupt and unbelieving Church in the faith and hope, in the hunger and thirst after righteousness, of those who do not even know that He is their teacher and their leader? Can we doubt that it is the Son of Man Himself who has come again into His Church in the persons of this rough multitude of His disciples? "The Son of God goes forth to war." These, whatever they may call themselves, are bearing His banner; they "follow in His train." They are marching "manfully under His banner," as the office for Holy Baptism puts it, "against sin, the world, and the devil"—against selfishness, Caste-rule, and Mammon-rule. May each one of them "continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end." May he freely subject himself to the rule of Him by whom he sees the world needs to be ruled.

The undogmatic "socialism" of the desolate and oppressed, when it speaks freely out of its own heart and conscience, falls back upon the words with which the crucified and ascended Head of Humanity has provided His brothers and sisters. It reminds "Christians" that they are living in rebellion against Christ. It does not articulately name itself "Christian Socialism." No: but it declares inarticulately that the thing which economists, politicians, scholars—in hatred or in love—call "Socialism" is itself "Christian."

THE POOR ARE GOD'S ELECT AND THE WORLD'S CREDITORS¹

“Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour ; which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you : Ye shall find the Babe wrapped in swaddling clothes and lying in a manger.”—ST. LUKE ii. 10-12.

THE evangelist here shows us the contents of the first Christmas Day sermon. He calls the Church to look at the first preacher of the Gospel and the first hearers of it. It is significant that we owe this story of the shepherds, which the consciousness of Christendom has always recognised as containing the very pith and heart of the doctrine of Christmas, to St. Luke, the evangelist of the nations, the disciple of St. Paul. We can imagine with what joy this evangelist must have recorded the fact that the elect congregation which the Lord gathered first to hear the Gospel was not made up of the world's *élite*, but was made up of shepherds. Shepherds were a very mean sort of men, as the respectable and learned among the Jews then judged. Nay, it was worse than this. They were coupled by the strictly religious world of that day with pagans. According to the treatise called Sanhedrin, as Godet tells us, shepherds were not to be admitted as witnesses in a court. “But God,” as St. Luke's master wrote to the Church of

¹ Christmas, 1885.

Corinth, "hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise: and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen." It was therefore in accord with His law of action for Himself, exhibited so repeatedly in history, that He should choose men condemned by the religious world, and thought unworthy to be witnesses, to be the first hearers of the Gospel, the first witnesses to the birth of the world's Redeemer.

I.

"There were in the same country shepherds," says the evangelist, "who were keeping watch over their flocks," remaining out in the fields "by night." May we not suppose them to have been shepherds, of quite exceptional character? No: St. Luke omits the article; he does not say "*the* shepherds." There seems therefore to be no ground for the fanciful imagination of some that these elect of God may have been those particular shepherds who kept the sacred flocks for the Temple sacrifices. The evangelist has simply nothing to tell the Church about the exceptional character of the men, In a legend, or in a fable of class-invention, the men chosen out of the whole human race to be the first hearers of news so stupendous, and of such importance "to all the people," would have been prodigies of piety—no common shepherds, but wonderful philosophers, or poets, or prophets—in shepherds' clothing. The evangelist's language, because he is an evangelist, has in it no hint that there was anything in them differencing them from any ordinary group of wage-earning men, thrown into one another's company by what we call the chances of life, by the search for daily bread. They

were simple, pious, and patriotic every-day Hebrews. These three characteristics come out in the course of the short narrative. But there was amongst them no David, who out of a shepherd became a king; no Amos, who out of a shepherd became a prophet; no Thomas Scott, who out of a shepherd became a great priest of the flock of God in England. We never hear again in the Gospels of any one of these shepherds. Perhaps they were all dead when the Lord Jesus began to teach and preach.

II.

God, according to His angel, elected these shepherds to hear the happy Christmas news (1) for their own sake, and (2) for the sake of their whole nation. The message is an individual one—"Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings." The bright angel out of the unseen world wishes the poor shepherds, and really brings to these simple and ignorant men, a "merry Christmas." His words stand in the Greek: "Fear not; for behold I *evangelise* you." Here we learn what it is, according to the very first announcement of the Gospel, to "evangelise" a man, a parish, or a people. The Gospel out of heaven does not produce terror in poor and hard-working men. No; it finds terror and it removes it. The preacher, whether angel or man, is not sent to frighten simple and ignorant men, shepherds, daily wage-earners. The preacher who thinks that he must first of all terrify simple men and women, and then when their terror has reached a fever heat—not till then—put before them what he pleases to call "the Gospel," is no evangelist, if the angel was a true "evangelist." God sends His evangelists to the poor. God does not send His evangelists, He sends His prophets, armed with threats and terrors, crying "Woe unto you!"—not to

the shepherds, not to the poor, simple, ignorant wage-earners, in the fields at night, but—to the rich, powerful, respectable, learned, and religious in the Temple, in the synagogues, in the schools, and in the palaces of Israel. It seems a mockery and an irony, in our wicked land, where thousands upon thousands are so much poorer than the poorest Jewish shepherd was—where thousands are not even earning wages, and have small prospect of permanently earning them—to say to such, “I wish you a merry Christmas.”

Oh, if we but knew this day how to say to them, in a living and an English form, exactly what the angel said to the Hebrew shepherds, and if we but knew this day how to make it mean to wretched and hopeless English workers without work all that it meant to those Hebrews on that night! “Unto *you* is born this day, in the city of London, in the city of Newcastle, in the borough of Hackney, in the isle of Skye, a Saviour!” “A Saviour!” “Christ!” “Lord!” Ah! they have heard the name of Jesus so often in the churches and chapels and so-called mission-halls, that they have come to think it to be nothing but the label put upon a mythological or otherworldly figure, which is talked about by comfortable gentlemen in pulpits, and by patronising ladies in Sunday Schools. If any angel came out of the unseen, and said to a group of London crossing-sweepers, or of London sandwich-men, or of East-end seamstresses for a great English contractor, “To you is born this day a Saviour, Christ, Lord”—do you think they would understand him? Why did the poor shepherds in the fields of Bethlehem rejoice at that Gospel which to the poor men and women who will try to sleep to-night on the stone seats of London and Blackfriars Bridges means nothing at all? Because whenever a Jew heard the glorious title,

“Saviour,” Liberator, Redeemer, he connected it with the real salvation, liberation, emancipation of his wretched ancestors from their slavery to their taskmasters in Egypt. Whenever a poor Hebrew heard the more glorious title “Christ,” he looked forward to the most complete possible institution of justice and happiness for all in his own land on this earth. “The law,” as St. Luke’s great Hebrew master said, “was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.” I am sure that the Apostle of the Nations would tell us that we in England, rich and poor alike, can never know what the Gospel is, what the New Testament is, until we understand what the Old Testament is, what the law is—that law every commandment of which comes from the One who said: “I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other gods but Me”—shall recognise none, trust none, but the One who is Saviour, Liberator, Redeemer, Emancipator of the oppressed and wretched and defrauded.

I have left myself small space and time to speak of a point which to us is now still more important. “There” was Cæsar Augustus in Rome giving order that all the world should be taxed. There was Herod in his palace; “there were” diligent priests in the Temple; “there were” learned scribes studying the text of Holy Scripture to find out smart and ingenious things to say about it and about the Christ; “there were” pious Pharisees laying down methods of devotion for those who aimed at their own individual religious perfection. None of these were startled by the vision of an angel; none of them were chosen by the Eternal Father to be the first hearers of the Gospel of the birth of the world’s Redeemer. But, “there were, in the same country, shepherds abiding in the field”—a most

despised class of the population, for whose conversion, it may be, the other and wealthier classes were holding "missions." Through that class it was made known to humanity that its new Adam had appeared in the world. The poor are God's elect; they are God's social mediators between Him and the other classes into which society is divided. All the subsequent history of Christendom is rich with confirmations, in great matters and in small matters, of the principle which was asserted and proclaimed in the beginning of its history by the angel—which no man has ever asserted or proclaimed. "This shall be a sign unto you: ye shall find a babe"—it is not *the* babe in St. Luke—"wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying"—where?—"lying in a manger." The Father had determined that His Eternal Son, the Mediator between Him and all our kind, the Hope of every poor shepherd, the Hope of Israel, the Hope of England, shall be the Son of a poor woman, shall be first recognised and worshipped by poor men, shall live and die a poor man. In order to be the Redeemer of every creature, He who was born on Christmas Day was obliged to be poor. Humanity not only owes its salvation, but Europe and England owe what little and paltry degrees they have as yet attained towards true "civilisation" to that Poor Man, who, like last night's outcasts on London Bridge, had no fit bed where to lay His head.

Christmas Day is indeed then, as our fathers before us have perceived, the day on which above all other days we ought to remember what we *owe* to the poor. I do not mean what we ought to give them. I am speaking of what the poor have given, and are still giving, to us. Our debt to the poor is already so huge that we can never hope by any amount of gifts to repay

it. How poor all the rich would be, but for the poor! How miserable all the fortunate and happy would be, but for the poor! What fools and idiots all the learned would be, but for the poor! The houses in which we live, and which they built; the clothes which we wear, and which they have made; the food which we eat, and which they have sown and reaped or brought over stormy seas; the books which make us scholars, or give us pleasure, and which they have printed; the railways, which speed us to our homes and to our friends, and on which they labour—by these, and by a hundred other signs around us, the King of the Poor, announced on this day to the poor shepherds, is calling upon us to pay what little we can of our debts. If we do not pay it, He will come to us, as He came to other nations, as the Judge of the poor. The poor are in every nation the majority, and they multiply faster than all other classes. If they willed, and if they were to organise themselves, they could at any moment destroy the whole fabric of society that now is. If Christ Jesus, their King and Judge, were to lift up His restraining hands, the poor would become the modern Attila, “the scourge of God,” to sweep clean His befouled and corrupted Christendom. Let us all, in such ways as Christ their King and Judge may open to us, go to them with the evangelical tidings of great joy—taking care that it shall be what to shepherds and poor men really is good news—“Unto you is born this day a Saviour, a Christ, a Lord!”

RIGHT, AS JUSTICE, AND AS CHARITY ¹

“Whatsoever is right, I will give you.”—ST. MATT. xx. 4.
(Holy Gospel for Septuagesima.)

ST. MATTHEW had been a tax-gatherer, and he had consequently gained much experience about money questions, though from their coarsely practical rather than from their ideal side. Twice in the course of this parable an ideal of money payment is erected. First, when the householder sends into the vineyard those whom he found unemployed at the third hour, he said, “Whatsoever is right, I will give you”: and to those whom he found unemployed at the sixth and ninth hour, he “did likewise.” Secondly, when he found a number of men still unemployed at the eleventh hour, he said to them also, who had lost all hope of earning a full wage, “Whatsoever is right, that ye shall receive.” We are startled, as they and their fellow-workers were, at finding that what they “receive” is exactly the same as that paid to those who had the happy lot of being employed all the day long.

I.

The covenant of the employer, however, taken by itself, engages that work and wages are to be reconciled; they are to be proportionate to one another. For work

¹ February 6, 1887.

—"Go ye also into the vineyard." For wages—"And *whatsoever is right*, I will give you." "*Whatsoever is right*, that shall ye receive."

This is indeed a great engagement, a wonderful contract, a daring covenant. Like all that is ideal, it seems at the first glance to be somewhat vague, and it arouses sceptical temper. What employer, what receiver of wages for work done, can be quite trusted by the other to rule the exact measure of "whatsoever is right"? The good employer fears lest he should give less than what is right, and the good worker fears lest he should take more than is right. The difficulty lies in the standard of "right." We notice, indeed, that two different standards of "whatsoever is right" are set up successively in this parable of the kingdom of heaven. We see the first in the opening of the history, where it is said that the householder agreed with the labourer for "a penny a day." That is a contract—it is signed by both sides; they treat as equals. The same standard reappears in the last chapter but one of the history, where he says to the spokesman of the discontented class, "Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny?" But we see another standard of right in the ending of the history. "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil because I am good?"

"Right," that inexhaustible word, that inexhaustible conception, is set before us by the Lord—"the Lord our Righteousness"—in the course of this parable under two successive aspects; first as justice, and finally as goodness, or as charity, or grace. The labourers in the vineyard in our generation have begun to cry very loudly to the employing classes—"We want justice, not charity." That is their conception of right, if not of right in itself, yet of their rights; I need not say here

how my whole soul sympathises with it. But I am bound to say that the conception of right as justice, or as equity, or as equality, is not a full and adequate conception of it. It is the legal or judicial idea of right. It is not the moral idea of right. It is the positive rather than natural or eternal conception of it. I say "natural" or "eternal," meaning here by "nature" that which is first of all and last of all, that out of which everything has its beginning and in which everything has its ending. "God is" by nature, as His apostle says, "charity"—"God is love." It is as eternal charity, as eternal love, as eternal good, that God is the source of right, the author of justice, the institutor of law. The object of every parable of the Kingdom of Heaven—the kingdom which the creatures entreat their Father "may come" on earth—is to reveal the nature of its unseen King. This parable opens on earth; it begins with a scene which is being exhibited in thousands upon thousands of places every day—a simple contract between an employer of work and a few workers. Every time I get into a railway carriage, every time you buy anything across a shop-counter, there is a repetition of the first scene between the householder and the labourer. We become, in our degree, employers. In that character, as the Son of God discloses at the end of the drama—however unconscious we may be of it—we are showing that we are made in the image of God; we are partakers, as the apostle says, of His nature.

Our first demand from those whom we employ, and their first demand from us, is justice. "Whatsoever is right" means that they should give us exactly what we buy, and that we should give them exactly the covenanted price for it. Justice, equity, equality, in the covenant between man and man, is properly the

first demand of every one, whether employer or employed. "When he had agreed with the labourers for a penny a day he sent them into his vineyard." There was no "charity" here, in the sense in which we ordinarily use (or rather degrade) that word. The "penny" was as fully theirs as the vineyard was his. If they would have starved but for his hiring them, what would have become of his vineyard, and ultimately of him, if they had not gone to work in it? Take labour out of the world, and landlords and capitalists will soon find that they only differ from the labourer as men who starve at the ninth or eleventh hour of the day differ from the man who starved early in the morning. The householder needs the labourer in order to keep himself alive, to save his own children from sinking downward into savages and into beasts, and to prevent the vineyard, whose fruit is for the joy of both, from becoming a useless wilderness. "Right," in the sense of justice, is in the actual world, as it is in this parable, the first condition to be established between man and man when they come into contact. If the labourer has no right to work and wages, the householder has no right to the vineyard and wine. His title to the vineyard and its fruit rests on justice, and the labourer has exactly the same title to work and wages. A vineyard is probably chosen as the field of the contract because the fruit of the vine—individual strengthening and social gladness—was regarded by the Hebrew people as the characteristic gift of God to man as man, the gift to which a labourer had equal divine right, as he had equal bodily need, as the householder. This equality of householder and labourer as fellow-needers and so fellow-possessors of the earth and its fruits, cannot be manifested by "charity" so called. Why? Because in all "charities" the one must appear

as the inferior of the other : the one be a gracious giver, the other more or less a grateful receiver.

II.

At the ending of the parable, as we have seen, the idea of "Right" again appears. It now appears independently of justice, contract, or agreement. We now see the realisation of the high ideal with which the householder attracted the unemployed—"Whatsoever *is right*, that shall ye receive." He has raised them at the last hour to a level with the more fortunate classes of world-history. The malcontented classes, by the mouth of their leader, raise the banner of "justice" against goodness, against equality, against charity in its fullest sense. "Thou hast made them equal unto us." They do not indeed accuse the householder of being unjust to all who have worked in the vineyard ; nor of being unjust in himself. The complaint is a class-grumble ; they accuse him of being unjust to their particular class. They accuse him of expropriating their class of its specific privilege and property. They have been the very aristocracy of labour, and so they indignantly protest against the elevation of a lower class to equality with their class. The princes despise the nobles ; the nobles sneer at the rich merchants ; the merchants scorn the shopkeepers ; the shopkeepers are displeased at the claims of the artisan ; the artisan thinks the unskilled labourer ought to know his place. They murmured against the good man of the house, saying, "These last have wrought but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day." They do not really complain, as you see, of the violation of contract, but

they complain of the presence of an equalising love, charity, grace, and goodness.

This is the ultimate revelation of God's nature and character, and of His relation to men. The householder is now completely revealed as the image of the Eternal Householder, whose the earth is, and of whose family every man as a man is a member. The King of the Kingdom of Heaven alone has the right to say—no earthly contractor can have such a right—"Is it not lawful for Me to do what I will with Mine own?" "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." Therefore, as we now learn to say, it is not the landlord's. The vineyard—by the standard of that "Right" which is higher than justice and contract, that "Right" which is eternal charity—does not belong to the householder; neither does it belong to the noble or successful classes whose work has made it fertile. It belongs equally to the unsuccessful, who, in the hour of their despair, are called into it to do what little they can. Hence, at the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven and at the doing of the will of the eternally Righteous One on earth, the full and equal inheritance is given by the Father of all, through the Brother and Judge of all, to the disinherited. "Whatsoever is Right" is manifested in His complete revelation of it, to be more than justice; it is shown to be the eternal charity, love, grace, and goodness. "Is thine eye evil, because I am *good*?" How has the inherent goodness, this absolutely perfect "Right" of the Householder been manifested to the jealous and grumbling class? By His vindication in the course of the parable (which is the course of history) of the rights of a class below them in advantages to equality with them in wage and in enjoyment. I ought rather to say by His entire non-recognition of any distinctions of class, of any aristocracy of age or merit,

such as *they* had set up. "I perceive," said the apostle, when the Father showed him that his Roman child was as dear to him as His Hebrew children, "that God is no respecter of persons."

"Right" as justice, right expressing itself as "contract between equals," does not acknowledge the claims of man as man. "Right" as charity—right as revealed in the Incarnation or man-becoming of Him who is "the Lord our Righteousness" and in the self-sacrifice of God's Eternal Word—ignores the existence and privileges of classes, and acknowledges only the equal rights of men. The mere contracting right, merely legal justice, can only say: "Whatsoever you have earned, whatsoever you can claim upon contract—a penny a day—that shall you receive." But the Father of all has said to needy men, as He does say to them by His Eternal Word, Who is man's brother and man's judge, "Whatsoever *is right* I will give you." Well, what does He give? Not whatsoever men have earned, but whatsoever men need. The "penny a day" promised by contract, stood for the just wage which a man needed, whether employed or unemployed, in order to be properly a man, in order to have a day's shelter, food, clothing, and comforts of life. It is the sum which is due therefore from humanity to every man, if he is to live a humane life. It is his "daily bread": it is that which the grace of God, as "our Father," gives to each man by making him a man. His "right" to it is anterior to all contracts.

It is the chief business of every political commonwealth on earth, as an image of the Kingdom of Heaven, to provide that each man shall have that "penny a day" which God, who is love, has declared to be his, and that a vineyard shall be opened in which every man can earn his wage and enjoy its fruits. The

Heavenly Economist declares that righteousness to all men stands above all "rights," pleaded by the individual or the class. "Take that thine is, and go thy way; I will give unto this last even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for Me to do what I will with Mine own? Is thine eye evil because I am Good?"

THE INDISSOLUBLE UNION BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND THE NATIONS ¹

“Go ye therefore and teach all nations.”—ST. MATT. xxviii. 19.

“For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify my office.”—ROM. xi. 13.

“That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God.”—ROM. xv. 16.

“I am ordained a preacher and an apostle (I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.”—1 TIM. ii. 7.

THE Epiphany is called, in an alternative sub-title to the collect of that festival, “the Manifestation of Christ to *the Gentiles*.” The latter word is so archaic and academic, it has become so exclusively a part of the technical speech of the theologian, that it probably slips by the general ear without calling forth any very definite or practical thought. The word “Gentile” seems to have about as much to do with the actual life and business, the plans and excitements of men and women in London, as the words Midianite, or Philistine, or Samaritan, or Pharisee, or Sadducee—less indeed

¹ A Sermon preached at Bedford Chapel, Bloomsbury (the Rev. Stopford Brooke’s), Sunday, January 13, 1878. (It need scarcely be said that this sermon was preached before Mr. Stopford Brooke formally separated himself and his chapel from the Church.)

than either of the four latter, since their names are not out of date, they are still in hourly use amongst us moderns as epithets.

I.

Let us translate the old language into our current manner of speech: let us recollect that we profess to come together to celebrate "the manifestation of Christ to *the Nations*," "to the Peoples," or in pure English, "to the Folks." Such a revision of words at least gives a hint to those inside the Church and those outside that a very daring claim is made for Jesus Christ by His Society when it keeps the Epiphany. We are led out of the Sunday region of technical preaching and commentating, back to that same solid world with which we are in contact during our every-day struggle for existence—which we connect rather with the roll of the cabs and omnibuses outside this church, than with the Psalms which we sing and the Lessons to which we listen inside it. We should suffer no perceptible detriment if the word "Gentiles" were abolished for ever from the language of every one who is not a philologist. It is a word of the University, not a word of the Folk. We should suffer a far greater loss if the words "Samaritan" or "Pharisee" dropped out of our daily speech. But we should go back to barbarism, nay, to bestiality itself, if it were possible to expel the word "Nations" (with the whole cycle of its applications) from our thought and our talk.

It is this word, or the fact represented by this word, which lies at the ground of the accidental relation between you and me this day. I, a stranger to all of you, have no title to minister before the Lord for you in this building, or to speak to you in His name, except that which I derive from the fact that I am a *Nation's*

priest, "a teacher of *the Gentiles* in faith and verity." That is to say, I should have no right to be here if I were a priest in some vague, diffused, ultramontanist, or internationalist sense—a minister of the Pope or the Positivists ; if I received the law from the Jerusalem in Rome or the Jerusalem in Paris ; nor if I were merely a lecturer on religious topics ; nor if I were the agent of a religious club or company totally independent of the *National* order, the minister of a sect founded on agreement in doctrine or discipline ; nor if I were a pious person engaging in worship with a voluntary aggregation of other pious persons. You can demand of me my letter of holy orders as my title to minister for you.

At a time while the Philistines are shrieking for the separation of the Church and the State or Nation—that is, for the denial of any positive relationship between Christ and "the Gentile"—I feel that "I magnify my office" when I rejoice that the civil servants of the Nation could expel me from this place if I were anything less than the ecclesiastical servant of the Nation. I am here, not to speak to you loosely as Christians, but directly to "speak to you Gentiles"—to assert by my function, as well as by my doctrine, that which the Apostle of the Nations declared again and again to Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and to his disciple Timothy, that there is an organic relation between Jesus Christ and the Nations : that the Catholic Church, or Christ's universal human society, is inherently, and not accidentally, connected with "all Nations" as Nations ; that the minister of Christ's Church, whatever be his individual theories about the proper relations of the Church and the State, is in fact an *ex-officio* minister of the Nation of which he is a native, and of the State or Commonwealth of which he is a member and subject.

The subjection and service of Christ's bishops and priests to the States or Nations of which God has constituted them citizens and members, must not be thought a fond thing vainly invented by Constantine, or Justinian, or Charles the Great. It is antecedent to all legislative expressions of it in the shape of so-called establishment or endowment, and it is quite independent of such accidents. The "union of Church and State" cannot be dissolved but by the dissolution of one or the other. It is of the same nature as the union between Church and Family. Even although the historical attempts to express this union by "establishment" or by "endowment" of a certain number of the National clergy should be swept away as a clumsy and insufficient expression of it, the union itself will still subsist; and it will in all ages and all commonwealths somehow manifest itself. For it belongs to the substance of the Catholic Church—as founded by Jesus Christ, and as developed by St. Paul, the Apostle of the Nations—to be National. A Church that is not National, ideally or actually, cannot be a part of the Church of Him who sent His apostles to make disciples of "all Nations." Nearly all the sorrows of the clergy of Christendom in our generation have sprung from this—that they have striven to become independent of their Nation, and dependent either upon an international authority in the Holy City—like those primitive Ultramontanists of "the Circumcision" with whom the Apostle of "the Nations" was in lifelong conflict—or else dependent upon some religious or political party which thinks the world ought to accept its decrees.

II.

I can easily realise that a time may come to a completely developed Nation when it will be obliged to

declare itself creedless and confessionless, and refuse any further subsidy to the clergy of the Church. But I find it hard to realise how any one can read the New Testament, under the increasing light which has been shed upon it during the last half-century of criticism and political experience, without perceiving that the word academically rendered "Gentiles" is almost its most important word; that its meaning is not reached by any mere negative definition as "*not Jews*" or as the totality of *uncircumcised* men, nor even by the petty positive definition of it as "the Pagans" or "the Heathen"—"die Heiden" of Luther's Bible, who, however, in the text (St. Matt. xxviii. 19) speaks of "*alle Völkner*." The word "Nation," when it occurs in the New Testament, demands the same positive interpretation which it receives in the columns of the newspaper, the chapters of the historian, or the appeals of the patriot. In sending His apostles to Humanity, for the proclamation of the Good News about man's relation to God and the formation of a universal-human believing society, Jesus, if we may trust the evangelists, recognised as the two principal elements in our race—Nationality and Personality. Christ's Church, according to Christ's plan, was to be a society for Nations and a society for consciences. The two most precious liberties were at least explicitly acknowledged in the original command to preach the Gospel and offer Baptism to Humanity as a whole. The apostolic founders of the Church, as commissioned by the Lord, had "all Nations" (according to the first Gospel) "every creature" (according to the second Gospel) set before them as their aim. Hence the Catholic Church can no more cease through any such political accident as "Disestablishment" to be national, than it can cease to be catholic or to be human. The national aim of the apostolic and ministerial calling

was so remarkably emphasised by the call of the last, the most characteristically apostolical apostle, "the Apostle of the Nations," as to be placed beyond all doubt. Hence whenever the Christian clergy scorn or ignore the Nations—when they see in the State, in the Commune or Parish, and in the national liberty, culture, free development, and language, only something carnal and worldly, outside the Kingdom of God and of Christ—they become not merely anti-national, but manifestly anti-Christian. They invert the very meaning of the Epiphany. Hence also if a State should say to the Church, "I am no longer in union with you," the Church will still be bound by its very nature and invention to say to the State, "But I am still in union with you." When the Church cares not to be national, denies that it has any affinity to the Nation as such, refuses a certain subjection to the Nation, and attributes no more divine character to the State than the State claims for itself—it sinks into a mere pious club, or a sect of clerics and clericalists. Are you not glad that the Irish Church, after its disestablishment by the State, is so possessed by the original Christian consciousness as to assert its continued union with the State or Nation, as it does by still calling itself "The Church of Ireland"? The Church of Christ is not "national"—as the agents of rival societies for protecting or destroying the property of Church patrons may imagine—because it is established by the Nation, not because the Nation has permitted or assented to its self-establishment. It is national simply because it is *the Church*. Every Nation in Europe has discovered that an established clergy is capable of becoming the most anti-national force within its jurisdiction, nay, even of constituting a standing anti-national opposition. But the national "clergy" are not

the national "Church." The Church in its national entirety (as we have seen in our own day in Italy, in Germany, in France, and I think we may say, in England) knows how to respect and to use its clergy without accepting them as its political instructors, or slavishly following them and the clericalists to the poll in the matters of the State and the Commune.

III.

If I have been able to make even a drift of my meaning clear, you will see why I think we cannot regard the keeping of the Epiphany of Christ—the manifestation of the Divine Head of Humanity to the Nations—as an archaic and worn out observance, foreign to modern modes of thought, unconnected with the interests and excitements of the ordinary course of our lives. The Church by maintaining the observance of this festival has been teaching more than it has recognised, infinitely more by the bare observance of it than by the clergy's regulation interpretation of the observance. It is as citizens, not merely as Churchmen, that we thank God for the Epiphany of Christ to the Gentiles, for the making known of their King and Redeemer to the Nations. The Church is forced, by the original character of her mission, to look upon humanity, and upon all the organic members of humanity—nations, communes or parishes, families, and persons—in their ideal aspect, and to hold and keep up its own ideal before each. "Go ye into all the world, and make known the Good News to every creature." What news? That the most sunken and hopeless slave or criminal has a personality infinitely better and higher than he thinks. Tell the slave that he can be free, the criminal that he can be good; tell the bondslave of evil that he is the Son of

The Good ; that all things can work together for him, because the Source of Nature and the Manager of events is his own Father. Call every such prodigal to "come to himself"; and when he is indeed face to face with himself, he will there find the fundamental truth of his being, his sonship to God. Hence the Church esteems the vilest criminal, not first as a criminal, but first as a man—the fellow of the one indivisible humanity of which Jesus is the Head. Hence also the Church, by baptism and absolution, reconciles and unites to humanity the very man whom the State is compelled to regard first as a criminal, and to excommunicate from its fellowship. The States or Nations rise to the same plane as the Church when they make their punishment remedial; and I imagine that we may claim the entire humane change of attitude taken by States towards their criminal citizens to be one result of the Manifestation of the Son of Man to the Nations.

IV.

As the Church of Jesus Christ is bound to regard "every creature," so is she bound to regard "all Nations" after this ideal and potentiality. The thief has learnt from the Church that he is a man, a son of God, and has converted himself from thieftoold to pure manhood. So the hordes and tribes, and many a *natio irrendenta*, the Israels in Egypt, have learned through the Church that they were nations, or ought to be learning that they are. The Church (which according to the sectary, the heretic, and the internationalist, has as such nothing to do with the Nations) has again and again quickened the consciousness of nationality, and has been the active developer of it, where the State has either been the name for an imperialist tyranny attempt-

ing to crush nationality, or has been a company of serfs too feeble or depraved to assert it. I might attempt to illustrate the doctrine of the Epiphany by reference to the chief question which at this moment divides the so-called Liberal party in our own nation—the proper relation between the Church and the modern State. But I would rather ask you to look abroad, at that corner of Europe toward which the eyes of all the civilised nations are now directed, for an illustration of the redeeming work which may be wrought in the Nation by the perception that the Church and the Nation are inherently united. There, a Nation has been arising under our very eyes: and it is the Church, rather than the State, which has perceived its implicit subsistence, and which has called it into actual existence. What has been “the State” in Bulgaria? If by the State we mean the Turkish Khalif and Pashas, they certainly had no desire that the Slav agricultural communes in the Illyrian triangle should dream or assert that they constituted a Nation. If by “the State” in Bulgaria we mean (as I think we should mean) the totality of the rude Bulgarian natives, the Commonwealth of Bulgarian folk, it is by their Church that the conviction of their nationality has been suggested to them; it is the Orthodox Church which has kept alive in them the national instinct; and the Church has been the medium through which they have given it expression. The tribes of that cruelly oppressed Slav Israel in the Ottoman Egypt were probably no better or more cultured than Pharaoh’s Hebrew slaves; but they have believed for years that Christ has been “manifesting Himself” to them, that there has been a real relation between a divine and unseen Redeemer and the Nation of Bulgaria. The baptism of the down-trodden Slav has preserved his potential citizenship:

Christ's sacrament has kept alive in coarse farmers and keen traders the national consciousness, while the rich and aristocratic Christians of the East, who after the fall of Constantinople passed over to Islam in order to save their landed property and their social status, have lost their nationality and must perish with the doomed Turk. These communes of the Balkan would never have known that they were the Bulgarian Nation had they not remained the Bulgarian faithful, Christ's Bulgarian Church. By the Bulgarian "Church" I mean of course the entirety of Bulgarian Christians—as by the Church of England I mean the entirety of christened English folk. Few persons in Western Europe know what a marvellous national struggle the poor Bulgarian priests and laity had fought and won (a pledge of their right to acknowledge their national self-government) before the war broke out, or before there was any prospect that the Day of Christ was "nigh at hand," that "redemption" from the Turk was near. I speak of their long struggles for the use of the most sacred language, their own native tongue, in their liturgy, and for the genuine nationality of their Church by its liberation from the orthodox form of Ultramontanism, its subjection to foreign Greek-speaking bishops thrust upon them by the alien Fanariot Patriarch of Constantinople, the Vatican of the East, which has been for so many ages the creature and the instrument of the Turk.

I say again, then, that upon every 6th of January and in the following series of weeks we do not celebrate under the archaic title of the Epiphany some extinct theological hypothesis, but we come into contact with the most modern and living of facts. The Catholic Church sees "all Nations," each National Church sees its own Nation, in the ideal aspect of Fatherland and Commonwealth. "The Manifestation of Christ to the

Gentiles" is a fit subject for a recurring Eucharistic thanksgiving to God for that indissoluble union—which Churches and States may ignore—but which He has "established" between the Church and the Nations. It is the union between the Kingdom of Christ and those Nations or States which the apostles of the King everywhere found and find already implied or existing in the anterior world-wide Kingdom of God. It is the union between each man's baptism and each man's citizenship. The Nations are the moulds and framework of the Father, the fatherlands into which Christ the Son intended His Church to be poured and to subject itself, and after whose outlines and limits it is to conform its own development. "Disestablishment" by a Cæsar or by a democracy, can no more "separate the Church from the State" than it can separate the Church from the Family, or God from Man.

THE RELIGION OF THE STATE REQUIRES THE THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH †

“For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet ; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shall love thy neighbour as thyself.”—ROM. xiii. 9.

IN this familiar passage of his letter to the Church of Rome, the Apostle of Nations puts side by side the religion of the State, and the religion of the Church. I should speak more exactly if I were to say that St. Paul brings forward the theology of the Universal Church as the justification and the complement of that religion which every State is obliged by its nature to hold and to proclaim by laws. It has indeed been the fashion of late years amongst some of our English sects to deny that the State has a religion, even to affirm that the State ought to be without a religion. Such a dogma would have seemed monstrous and inhuman to the citizens of Rome in the first century. If St. Paul had held or taught this doctrine of our modern Manichæans—which implies that the Civil Power is in its nature unmoral, if not immoral, unreligious, if not irreligious—it would have been as useless for him to preach the Gospel of Christ to Romans as to preach it to stones.

It is true that the State, abstractly viewed, has no

† November 29, 1885.

theological "religion." The State, as the State, is neither Mosaic nor Mohammedan, nor Buddhist, nor Christian, nor Positivist, just as the family, as the family, is neither Jewish nor Christian, Secularist nor Positivist. But as an actual living commonwealth of men and women, of rich and poor, of good and bad, the State can neither exist or thrive without a religion. The religion of the State is chiefly negative; it says to each subject and citizen, "Thou shalt not": whereas the religion of the Church is chiefly positive; it says to each man as man, "Thou shalt love." The State must care that its fatherless and its widows shall be visited in their affliction, which, according to St. James, is true and undefiled religion; but it cannot insist that this true religion shall be observed because it is demanded by "the God and Father" of mankind.

I.

The chapter from which the Eucharistic Epistle is taken opens with the apostolic reaffirmation of that fundamental belief of the universal conscience, the belief of every pagan Roman, that the civil power is "ordained of God." The Roman Empire was not a State or Nation, a Commonwealth or Fatherland, to all its subjects, in the sense in which England is to Englishmen and Englishwomen; for it included under its rule nations without freedom and millions of hopeless slaves. But it stood in the place of a State to all its subjects and citizens: and as such it was obliged, like every national State, to hold and to establish a religion. Hence St. Paul insisted, in this Epistle, that the Roman Church ought to unite itself to the Roman State. The first link of union between Church and State is the Church's free confession that the State has the same origin and the

same unseen King as itself, that the State is "of God," and that its ministers are "ordained of God."

What then is the necessary religion of every State or Commonwealth? That same national religion which the eternal I AM revealed through Moses to the liberated Hebrew slaves when they had been developed out of a loose alliance of tribes into a State or Commonwealth. There is an abiding national religion, which every nation has felt to be necessary to itself, and it is to this religion that the Apostle of the Nations here refers the Christians in Rome. Every State, if it is to be saved from utter secular disintegration and ruin, must protect the individual member and the entirety of its community by its laws, as far as it is able, from adultery, from murder and manslaughter, from theft, from libel and lying, from greedy exploitation.¹

A State, even if all its members were heathen or atheist, would find itself obliged to declare, in the form of a law or "commandment" to each of its members and citizens, to slaves and to freemen, "Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet." Hence when St. Paul, whom God had chosen and called out to be the Apostle of States or Nations, looked upon any State, he perceived by the revelation of Jesus Christ that it must be in itself, and because it was a State—apart from its acceptance or rejection of Christ's Gospel, apart from the establishment or disestablishment of Christ's Universal Church within it—the sacred social creature of God. He saw that every State must be as truly a province of God's Kingdom as ever his own State of Israel had been. A State can only live and thrive by

¹ "Thou shalt not bear false witness" is not in the best copies: but it is of course implied in the Apostle's climax, "and if there be any other commandment."

keeping the commandments of the God of Israel; it must decay and become extinct, or be enslaved by some stronger power, if it ceases to keep them.

II.

In the last clause of the text, St. Paul brings forward one commandment—or as he calls it, “the Saying” or “the Word”—in opposition to the many and varied old commandments which always had been and always are, in some form or other, the laws of every State. He tells the Church of Rome that the religion of the States, the unifying and fundamental Law implied by the varying laws of every State, “is briefly comprehended in this saying”—newest in manifestation but oldest in existence—“Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” We recognise this as the “new commandment” of Christ our Lord. But it is “new” only in the like sense as He is the “new Adam” and the “new Man”: the commandment, like the Commander, is Eternal, and is in this sense older than the old Adam and the old laws.

The verb which the apostle has chosen deserves a fuller attention than we now spare for it. He says that not only the laws by which States condemn adultery, murder, and theft, the laws of the second table of the Hebrew State, but that all laws which ever have been or can be passed by legislatures for the health and wealth of the community are “gathered up *again*” (*ana, re, rursus*) “under one head” (*anakephalaioutai*, are recapitulated). The disjointed secular fragments of the one eternal Law are reunited to the original source. “Again”—an original and eternal law has once for all commanded every spirit to “love.” The original and eternal commandment to love my neighbour as myself, which my conscience recognises as authoritative, con-

tains within it every law by which the State can forbid me to do any harm to my neighbour.

Do you not see the contrast between the many "commandments" and the one "Word"? "The powers that be" in any State, the powers which are ordained of God in the course of the historical evolution of a People—Cæsar's magistrates in Rome or in Judæa, ours in England—can compel a great degree of observance of their many and various commandments, such as "Thou shalt not commit adultery," or "Thou shalt do no murder," or "Thou shalt not steal." If the State is in a fair degree of health it will go hard with the subject or the citizen who is proved to be breaking them: "for," as St. Paul says, "the minister of God (in the State) beareth not the sword in vain." But thousands are breaking these laws every day, and the State does not punish them. It does not even detect them. Why do they break them? Because there is that in each man which the State cannot reach; there is in every ruler and subject that which Christian theology calls "the old man" and "the corrupt nature," which lusts to do those evil deeds which the religion or law of the State forbids. It is certain that if every subject and citizen kept the "Saying," if he loved his neighbour as himself, there could be no social sins—no adultery, no robbery, no cheating, no murder, no expropriation of the common land, no exploitation of labour, no stealing by the rich of the free schooling founded by ancient piety for the poor. But every one sees that it would be absurd for Cæsar to promulgate an imperial rescript, or for our Parliament to pass an Act solemnly commanding every man, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, to "love his neighbour as himself." It would be just as profitless for kings or national councils to pass laws prohibiting the look of lust or the feeling of spitefulness. Yet unless

the members of the State keep the new and inward commandment — the “Saying” or “Word” of the Eternal to every conscience, which is the source and original of all the commandments—they will constantly be breaking all the other commandments. This saying of the Eternal Word to the conscience is the one law which the State *needs* to have observed by every one of its members; and yet it is a law which a State is quite powerless to enforce upon any one. Why has the State to pass so many thousand laws, year after year, and century after century? Because its members and citizens do not keep this one original “Saying,” the Eternal Law. The very religion of the State, that which is most sacred and permanent in State-life, that which is absolutely necessary to the secular continuity of a State, implies and demands a force which the State cannot itself supply. It implies and demands the union of the State with the Eternal Kingdom, with a Commonwealth wider than itself. It implies and demands the free self-subjection of every subject of the State to the “Saying” of a King and Lord who is unseen.

Where this other force and other kingdom are, what they are, had been partly revealed, as the Apostle of States believed, in the evolution of the laws of his own native State of Israel. We have already seen that the commandments against adultery, robbery, murder, and any other good and needful laws and acts of rulers and parliaments, express the religion of all States. They are more or less the commandments of all States; they are the religion and the commandments of a State as a State. To say that “the State as such has no religion” is either to say that adultery and theft are not irreligious, or else that the State as such needs no restraint of its members from murder or bearing false witness, from

adultery or from burglary. But such commandments were only a part of the commandments which St. Paul's own beloved State, the Commonwealth of Israel, had received. The citizens of Israel had been taught that it is not the State alone which says to each of its members, for the sake of the whole of its members, "Thou shalt not commit adultery; Thou shalt not steal." Every citizen of Israel was taught that these political and social commandments were being spoken to each man's conscience by the Eternal I AM, who is the unseen Creator and the unseen Ruler and Judge of the State. The unseen and almighty One, who had found them slaves and raised them into freemen, before giving them those commandments which States are obliged to give, first of all gave them the commandment, "Thou shalt have none other gods but Me." An evangelical *theology*, an historical theology, was proclaimed to each conscience in Israel as the foundation and the justification of the *religion* and commandments of the State. "I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Therefore, "Thou shalt have none other gods but Me; Thou shalt not commit adultery; Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

The revelation of the original and ultimate Lawgiver—of the One who ever has been, ever is, and ever will be saying His commandment directly to each conscience—had been given only in part to the State of Israel. It was now made clear and open, according to St. Paul, for every conscience and for all nations through the Man-becoming of the Eternal Word. Jesus Christ is Himself "the Saying" of God. "The saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," is not only heard internally, it is seen externally in Jesus Christ. He, the true Light who is enlightening every

man who comes into the world, has founded a universal-human Society, greater and wider than any State, a Catholic Church : and it is the function of this Church to testify to every conscience and to all States their obligation to bring their lives into subjection to the one Law and the one commandment. Without obedience to this "Word" or "Saying," the legislation of States by their many laws on behalf of social righteousness is powerless. The second table of the law, the State's part of it, implies and needs the first table, the Church's part of it. Religion, which each particular State is obliged for its own sake to require from each of its subjects and citizens, implies and needs a Catholic Creed. Religion demands a Theology such as the Universal-human Church professes when she testifies to the good news of the Grace of God which has appeared to all men—slaves or freemen, outside the State or in it—through Jesus Christ. The secular commandment implies and needs the Eternal Faith, or Creed. The State, Nation, or Commonwealth everywhere implies and needs the Catholic Church. Every law which a national legislature enforces upon the individual subject for the health and wealth of the whole people, implies and needs the self-subjection of each conscience to the inward Law or "Saying" of God's Word and Holy Spirit, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

THE CHURCH AND THE PUBLIC-HOUSE:
OR, TEMPERANCE NOT TO BE USED
AS A CLOAK OF MALICIOUSNESS †

“As free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honour all men.”—1 ST. PETER ii. 16, 17.

TO-DAY has been announced as “Temperance Sunday,” at least in our Diocese of London, and I believe that all preachers are desired to say something in their sermons on behalf of one of the rarest of virtues. The extract from St. Peter’s first Letter, which serves us this week as the Eucharistic Epistle, contains many a passage which lends itself easily to such an application. The aged apostle begins by urging the members of the suffering and tempted Church of Christ in that age to “abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul.” The soul or life is only in health, strength, wholeness, and at peace when it breathes an atmosphere of temperance. All forms and degrees of intemperance—from the gorging of the glutton and the tipping of the drunkard to the frantic oratory and the unsocial tyranny of the teetotaller—have one and the same common source, “fleshly lusts.” Temperance is the least pretentious and brilliant of all virtues: the sight of temperance in our neighbour does not startle us into

“Temperance Sunday” (third after Easter, 1888).

admiration and applause of him, like the sight of faith, or love ; yet it is one of the hardest virtues to acquire, one of the hardest to keep when acquired. I may be most intemperate in my commendation of temperance.

Temperance is interior liberty. St. Peter beseeches us to live "as free." The intemperate—whether in meat, or drink, or thought, or deed, or dress, or speech,—are slaves. They are under a hard master and slave-driver ; they are subjecting themselves to a yoke such as Christ's freemen ought not to endure. His freemen are indeed called to live as "servants," as the apostle immediately adds ; but they are to live, he says, as "the servants of God." Hence the Church says daily in the second collect at the morning prayer of every parish, that "God's service is perfect freedom." It is the only service which is not slavery or serfdom, bondage or servility. Until we know that the absolutely Good is our Master, and know God through His Son Jesus Christ, and live as Christ's servants, we cannot live "as free." We shall live in a ceaseless craven terror of breaking somebody's laws, or losing somebody's good opinion, or violating some conventional prejudice or fashion which the world or age has set up in the place of God's eternal and perfect law. All biography shows that the only really free and independent souls are those which are single-hearted and direct in their service to God. Truly free men and women do not take counsel with flesh and blood, with carnal lusts, but go straight to Jesus Christ for the rule of life, and say, like Saul when he was liberated out of his hard slavery to the Pharisees : "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" He was converted from the intemperance of fanaticism to the true temperance of the service of Jesus Christ. Unconverted Saul could only say intemperately, after the laws and traditions of the other

Pharisees, who had called the Saviour a "wine-bibber" —"Touch not, taste not, handle not." The converted Paul could give his own disciple Timothy the temperate counsel, "Take a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." The converted apostle was free, as an English preacher said in 1615, to "meet his friends at the market of Appium, and drink at the Three Taverns." If our intemperate temperance advocates always had the courage of their opinions, they might own, like the rationalising old Scottish woman, "I think none the better of Paul for it"; or perhaps they would welcome as allies those rationalising critics who deny the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles.

II.

But while we emphasise St. Peter's championship of our freedom in Christ Jesus, we must not ignore the condition with which he qualifies it. As God's service is perfect freedom, so perfect freedom is God's *service*. That is to say, a liberty which does not deliberately choose to serve is no true liberty. Unless we chiefly love freedom because it releases us and enables us to serve, we have but the show of liberty, and not its substance; we are in the most wretched of all bondage, we are slaves to the hideous tyrant selfishness. You must live "as free," but also, as the apostle adds, "and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness." The distance between liberty and libertinism is but a span's breath to those who will not use their liberty for the service of God, for doing good to man. Temperance and tyranny, as we see by experience, lie equally near. Because the one has become "virtuous" are the many to have no more "cakes and ale"? Will it not be quite a legitimate accommodation of St. Peter's text to

this day's purpose if we paraphrase it, "As Temperate, and not using your Temperance for a cloke of maliciousness"? For as it is the special temptation of the free man to abuse his liberty to libertinism in thought and conduct, so it is the special temptation of the professional temperance-man to rush into the wildest degrees of tyrannical intemperance. It has become a truism that he exceeds all the rest of mankind in his intoxication. He has to be particularly on guard lest his temperance, like the other's liberty, be used "as a cloke of maliciousness." The maliciousness of the temperance man, as the outsiders view it, assumes two forms—firstly, a most unreasonable social or rather anti-social economy, which preaches against the public-house, as if it were the very Babylon of the Apocalypse, and as if the shortest and surest way of founding Sion in the earth would be the burning down of all inns, ale-houses, and hotels; and secondly, a most uncharitable indication of the landlords of inns as the chief agents of Satan and the most hurtful of all the foes of individual and social morality. A popular Independent preacher said a few days ago to a crowded audience, "*I could make a garden of Eden down in the East End in three months if I had my way.*" If he might "use his liberty," as St. Peter puts it, what would be his use of his liberty? "*My way,*" he continued, "would be a rough one at the first. I should do nothing but burn down all the breweries, and shut up all the public-houses. That is the way back to Paradise."

Is it? Paradise is the home of undivided religious unity as well as sobriety, and if we began by burning all the public-houses to secure national sobriety we should end by burning all the Churches, or all the Dissenting Chapels, or all the Secular Halls to secure national religious unity. That "rough" method has

been tried as the infallible way to national religious unity, and it has failed. Its failure would be equally conspicuous as the way to national sobriety. Men are not drunkards because there are breweries, but because they get from breweries what if there were no breweries they would get elsewhere. In "the Garden of Eden," according to the tradition, there seems to have been neither a brewery nor a public-house. Nevertheless, the tempter found his way into the Garden of Eden, and brought ruin upon all its inhabitants, who were all strict teetotallers. Neither, according to the tradition, did Cain come out of an inn when he murdered Abel, although it is the habit of our intemperate temperance-men to trace every modern murder directly or indirectly to "the bottle." But Cain was certainly a teetotaller.

A public-house is ideally a very noble, humane, and social institution. It is much more democratic than the modern club. The club is too often the centre of a caste, a class, or a party; it is exclusive, pharisaic, and anti-social. One club shuts out all who are not "gentlemen," another all who are not working-men. One club excommunicates Tories, another puts its bann upon Radicals. But the public-house or inn, according to its name, belongs to everybody, whatever his class, whatever his party. A man used to be welcome there, as in the Church of God, because he was human, and not because he was a sectary who could proffer some pharisaic or aristocratic differentiation between himself and the rest of the parish. The ancient relations between the parish church and the parish inn, as the spiritual and secular "public-houses" of the local republic, had a very wholesome side. The keen dialectic Archdeacon Paley chose an inn to write in. The saintly Archbishop Leighton said that he should like to die in an inn. Charles Kingsley, whom

the greatest of modern theologians called "the best of modern parish priests," would smoke his pipe in the village public-house, and drink out of the same pot as his poor parishioners. St. Francis de Sales, the most sensitive and refined of prelates, advised all his parochial clergy to begin by making a friend of the village inn-keeper. That most terrible mischief is done in public-houses—as well as in churches and Dissenting chapels—is too evident for anybody to deny. But nothing is so intemperate or fanatical as to sweep away an institution with a fine ideal, and still capable of being redeemed to excellent social service, because that ideal is now blurred and those services are not now rendered. The reasons why the public inn is degraded and mischievous lie far deeper than the intemperate "temperance-men" dare to look.

III.

It would much help us to grow in temperance if we would recollect that when Christ's holy apostle beseeches the Church to "honour all men" he does not add "except inn-keepers." Those Christian bishops and priests, whom I have just cited, honoured the "man" in the inn-keeper, and that was the true way of awakening in him the consciousness of the honourable function entrusted to him in the parish and the commonwealth, to which the ancient title of "host" bears witness. Samuel Fisher, the Quaker, in his answer to the attacks of the famous Independent, John Owen, protested against the Calvinist's denunciation of alehouse-keepers. "The calling is as honest in itself," said the sturdy Quaker, "as that of Gaius, the Church's host, or any other inn-keeper, though it be often much abused. What trade is not, when evil men manage it?"

I have but skimmed hastily the surface of an im-

portant subject, which I could not pretend to handle satisfactorily in so short a time. We cannot grow in the inward liberty, which is true temperance, if we pervert our liberty or our temperance into a "cloke of maliciousness." We do not change the ungodly character of such abuse by giving it the specious name of "Liberalism." To free our commonwealth from the gross sin of drunkenness, and from the miseries which follow it, is a noble and Christian object. But we shall help little towards that liberation if we are ourselves in bondage to the intemperate superstition that inns are the cause of drunkenness, or if we indulge the least degree of an intemperate and pharisaic spitefulness towards the inn-keeper. Rather "honour all men"—honour the man in the wretched slave of drink, as the Saviour honours the man under that and every other form and variety of sinner. Honour the man in the inn-keeper, whom our manifold social apostasies from Christ's Law, which I cannot here specialise, has degraded from the "host" which he ought to be, into a seducer of the poor and a tool of the capitalist fortune-hunter, which he ought not to be. The public-house does evil for the same reason that every other social institution does evil, because we have come to regard Mammon and not God as its proper ruler, as the supreme inn-keeper. It may be in part the fault of Christ's bishops and priests that the landlords of inns are so often apostates from their calling, and expropriate as their "customers" those whom they ought to honour as their "guests." But here in England, and in parts of the world, there are still hosts who care for the health and soberness of their guests, and who set their fellow Christians an example of walking worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called.

A FEW OF THE THINGS WHICH "CLERGY-
MEN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND"
HAVE SAID ABOUT LANDLORDISM
AND ROBBERY

"Remove not the old landmarks, and enter not into the fields of the fatherless: for their Redeemer is mighty; He shall plead their cause with thee."—PROV. xxiii. 10, 11.

"THE people are sorely oppressed," said Bishop Hooper, in June, 1549, "by the marvellous tyranny of the nobility." What direction was taken by the tyranny and oppression of the greedy nobles of Edward the Sixth's miserable reign is told us in the August of the same year by John Burcher, when speaking of the Rebellion of the Commons in June and July. That social revolution which accompanied the aristocratic disendowment of the National Church was the product, as he said, of "the injustice and oppression of the nobility. The nobility, partly by force and partly by fraud, had converted to their own use the pastures which had formerly been common." This old "member of the Church of England" anticipated Mr. Headlam. He said exactly the same thing in other words—That "the ground landlords had stolen land from the people."

The building up of huge landed estates, and the formation of new nobilities, out of the robbery of the poor and the robbery of the Church, which is the

peculiar heritage of the poor, marked each of the four great judicial epochs in the life of the English Church during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII.; the spoliation of the Church under Edward VI. and Elizabeth; the abolition of the National Episcopate and the expulsion of all the Liberal and Catholic clergy by the tyrannical Nonconformist Parliament during the Civil War; and the imposition upon the people of the so-called "Commonwealth" by the military oligarchy of Sectaries in 1649, all alike ended in the "estating" of a greedy landlordism, old and new, out of the plunder of the Church and of the poor. The fathers of Nonconformity and Disendowment, from the very first, had the eager political support and encouragement of the aristocracy and plutocracy. These two terms, indeed, were not then used: the usual terms of the pulpit were "Landlords and Usurers." Bishop Bancroft, in his famous sermon at Paul's Cross in the year of the Armada, 1588, referred to the confession which had been made by the author of the "Ecclesiastical Discipline," Travers, the opponent of Richard Hooker, "Whilst the gentry hear us speak against the bishops and cathedral churches," said he, "it tickleth their ears, looking for the like prey they had before of monasteries. Yea, they have in their hearts devoured already the Church's patrimony. They care not for religion so they may get the spoil. They would be content to crucify Christ, so they might have His garments. Our age is full of spoiling soldiers and of wicked Dionysiuses, who will rob Christ of His golden coat as neither fit for Him in winter nor summer." He described the heads of the great land-stealing caste, who urged the Nonconformists against the bishops, as "cormorants, who seek to fill the bottomless sack of their greedy appetites." Some

of these men kept Nonconformist chaplains in their great houses, and even compelled their tenants to attend the Separatist services in their own halls, and abstain from communion with the "mixed assembly" in their parish churches.

Throughout the reign of Elizabeth and James I. there was a ceaseless protest from bishops and priests of the English Church in their public sermons, against the robbery of the poor, and of the Church as the peculiar heritage of the poor, by the nobles and gentry. The magnificent homiletical literature of the English Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has been most industriously overhauled by the advocates of our rival Church parties in the search by each for historical darts to hurl at the other. But the English sermons have never yet been studied as sources for the culture-history of England, as words of our prophets in which we trace the education of the nation by the ever-living Word of God, and by His Vicar in every conscience, the Holy Ghost, "the Father of the Poor." The most faithful bishops and clergy of England saw clearly that the Puritanism of the great land-stealing families throughout the reign of the Tudors and the two first Stuarts was a covert for their robbery of the Church and the poor. "They do greatly urge in the ministry the apostolical poverty," said Bancroft to the people at Paul's Cross, "to the intent that they may obtain the prey." "I doubt not it is manifest to you," said the Bishop of London and future Primate, "that covetousness hath thrust them into this schism." The bishops were hated alike by the aristocrats and plutocrats, who sneered at the prelates for their "mean birth." The *tu quoque* of William Burton, preaching at Norwich against the greed which these "Liberationist" nobles and landed gentry hid under a pharisaical

pretence of zeal for religion, might be directed to the same classes in our own day. "Why, say some of these men, Can you not live as the apostles lived?" "Why, say I again, Let them lay down their goods at the apostles' feet, and then let them ask the question." The best of the reforming clergy did not shrink from saying boldly in the pulpit that the monks at their worst had been better than the nobles and gentry who had appropriated the monastic lands. "If ye were not stark blind," said Prebendary Thomas Lever at Paul's Cross, in Edward the Sixth's disastrous reign, "ye would see and be ashamed that fifty tun-bellied monks given to gluttony, filled their paunches, kept up their house, and relieved the whole country round about them, where one of your greedy guts devouring the whole house and making great pillage throughout the country, cannot be satisfied." I could spend hours in the citation of passages from sermons in which the Anglican bishops and clergy attacked the great landlords for their systematic robbery of the common lands from the poor. Their attempts in Kent to rob the poor of the common school were foiled by the courage and humane piety of Archbishop Cranmer. The stealing of the common lands from the local commonwealths by the infamous oligarchy which ruled England under the name of the boy-king, Edward, was declared by Thomas Lever from the pulpit to be "the greatest grief that hath been unto the People of this realm." These robbers were then recklessly enclosing "the commons of every town," said Roger Hutchinson, "so that no poor man can keep a cow upon them." The "covetous landlords," said Thomas Lever in his brave sermon before the young King, "*taking the grounds into their own hands*, turn all to pasture." He told the King and Court that the increasing pauperism of the nation

was the direct product of the grasping landlordism. The country folk, evicted from their farms by the nobles and gentry, despairingly streamed up to London. "So now," said he, "old fathers, poor widows, and young, lie begging in the miry streets." Turning from the King and the robbers to Christ Jesus, the champion of the poor, the preacher exclaimed, "O merciful Lord! What a number of poor, feeble, halt, blind, lame, sickly, yea, with idle vagabond and dissembling caitiffs mixed among them, lie and creep, begging in the miry streets of London and Westminster!" I need scarcely quote from so classical a book as the splendid sermons of the socialist and martyr bishop, Hugh Latimer, the darling of the London poor. When preaching before the King he fearlessly apostrophised the nobles and Court gentry in language which would horrify a Philistine English jury in our day—"You landlords; you rent-raisers; I may say, you step-lords; you unnatural lords, you have for your possessions yearly too much!" He was one of the first of the long and honourable series of the English clergy who protested from the pulpit against the "depopulation" of the country communes by a restlessly aggressive landlordism. "Where there have been a great many householders and inhabitants, there is now but a shepherd and his dog." Parliamentary laws had not helped the poor; for though the laws were good, the rich easily found a way to break them. "We have good statutes made for the Commonwealth," said the brave bishop, "as touching commoners and enclosers, many meetings and sessions, but in the end there cometh nothing forth." The "House of Commons," in defiance of its name, became more and more an assembly, not of commoners but of landlords. "I remember mine own self," said he, "a certain giant, a great man, who sat in commission about such matters;

and when the townsmen should bring in *what had been enclosed*, he frowned and chafed, and so near-looked and threatened the poor men, that they durst not ask their right." The aristocratic robbers, under Edward, as afterwards under the Stewarts, made a stalking-horse of the King ; in England, as in Prussia, as in Russia, as in Sweden, the poor and the clergy fled to the King as their only possible champion against the tyrannical aristocratic landlordism. This is the explanation of the undoubtedly historical truth that during the Civil War between Charles and his Parliament, under the short-lived "Commonwealth," and after the Cromwellian *coup d'etat*, the sympathies of the English democracy, the anti-puritanical masses, remained throughout on the side of the King. "The King beareth the slander," said Lever, in his appeal to Edward for the poor, "the poor feel the lack ; but who hath the profit of such things ?" "All the world seeth," he added, "that the Act of Parliament for the maintenance of learning and relief of the poor hath served some as a most fit instrument to rob learning and to spoil the poor."

Francis Trigge, preaching at Grantham, Lincolnshire, in Elizabeth's reign (1592), complained that "all towns are almost decayed and undone. *Their common things and lands*, whereby the common stocks of their town hath been wont to be maintained, be by some means or other *taken from them*." He cited "the good law of the Romans," "which established that no houses should be pulled down. This, thought they, in reason should be a decay of their commonwealth. This we may daily see in the country, where men nowadays will buy houses to pull them down, that they may have a prospect, that they may have a garden, or such-like pleasure. And so now, where Christ's Family hath been maintained, grow trees or nettles." William

Symonds, one of the clergy of St. Saviour's, Southwark, preaching in 1609 at Whitechapel Church, called attention to this combined onslaught of landlordism upon the Church and the Democracy. "The people, blessed be God," said he, "do swarm in the land, as young bees in a hive in June, insomuch that there is scarcely room"—in and about London—"for one man to live by another." The overcrowding, and the evils which followed it, were traced by the bold priest to the thievish landlordism of the day. "The mightier, like old strong bees, thrust the weaker or younger out of their hives. Lords of Manors convert townships, in which there were one or two hundred communicants, to a shepherd and his dog. *The true labouring husbandman*—who was wont to feed many poor, to set many people in work, and pay twice or thrice as much subsidy and fifteens to the King for his proportion of earth as his landlord did for three times as much—that was wont to furnish the Church with saints, the Nation with able persons to fight, is now in many places turned labourer, and can hardly scape the statutes of rogues and vagrants. The thoughtful poor woman, which hath her small children standing at her knee and hanging on her breast, she worketh with her needle and laboureth with her fingers. Her candle goeth not out by night. She is often deluding the bitterness of her life with sweet songs that she singeth to a heavy heart." Three years later, the eloquent Thomas Adams, whom the Nonconformist Long Parliament expelled in his old age from St. Bennett's, Paul's Wharf, preached in St. Paul's Cathedral against the sacrilege which accompanied the depopulation unceasingly carried on by the great landlords in the reign of James the First. The sermon was an attack upon the "gallants"—the contemporary social product of an idle landlordism—the

new courtiers of the new King's reign, the aristocratic and plutocratic "mashers" whom Adam called "heirs of Esau, and as profane as their father."

They hated the Churchmen. "We bite them with the salt of reproof; hence they storm." Some of this caste affected Nonconformity, "refractory to established orders"; others affected Libertinism; "no jest ends in such laughter as that which is broken on a priest." These prodigals were spending at the Court and in London the wealth which Esau, their father, had filched from the poor and from the Church, the peculiar heritage of the poor, in the country. The preacher mentions one "wicked Church robber," who had "pulled all the lead off the Church roof, and thatched it"—a frequent form of robbery with the Nonconformist nobles and gentry when they became stronger and could use the Parliament as their tool, only in those days they did not trouble to thatch it.

He sketches a portrait of the contemporary "sacrilegious patron, the pirate of the Church." "Many of these," he exclaimed, "are more cruel than Judas; they neither on repentance nor despair will bring back the price of *the Poor's blood which they have sucked!* Behold the earthy churl, to make his son a gentleman, prostituteth his honesty, conscience, soul, and forsaketh his own mercy. As the proverb is (vile, if even true), 'Happy is the son whose father goeth to the devil!'" It is worth noting what a London priest meant by going to the devil. "He hath mowed corn, or fatted his ox, on the very place where the town stood (*ubi Troja fuit*); nay, he hath kennelled his dogs within the walls of its sanctuary. *Non ignota cano!*" "There are some heirs," he says, "that exceed the tyranny of their fathers." The preacher insisted on "restoration" to the towns, the churches, and the poor, of that which the

landlord had stolen from them. But even "the better-instructed heir," he complains, does not think of this, "Seeing and detecting his dead father's deader courses," he withdraws his hand from extortion, from depopulation. But what reasons can make him a restorer? It is enough, he thinks, to cease wrong. But, "curse ye Meroz, saith the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they came not forth to help the Lord in the day of battle." Did they fight against God? No, "they helped Him not." These young heirs of this inhuman and sacrilegious landlordism, said the preacher in St. Paul's Cathedral, "*must restore the extorted lands and houses of their brethren; nay, remit some part of the debt.*" To the Nonconformist nobles and gentry, who paid to their Puritan domestic chaplains some small donation out of their plunder of the poor and of the "anti-christian" ornaments of the Church, Adams smartly said, "You have not robbed Peter to pay Paul, but to pay Judas." In a sermon to his own parish of St. Bennett's, Paul's Wharf, in 1616, Adams compared the depopulator to the wild boar "that will forage and lay all waste, if he be not restrained. Yea, he lays waste the commonwealth, though he encloseth to himself. He wasteth societies, community, neighbourhood of people; he turns them out of their own ancient doors, sends them to the wide world to beg their bread. Let this beast be hunted." In 1618 he made another attack upon "the destructive depopulator," "the oppressing landlord," "the Church defrauder." "He loves to ride in his own ground; and for this purpose expelleth all his neighbours." "He rides over the heads and hearts of the poor tenants." "The charitable man thinks of building churches, but starts to think that these men will pull them down again." In 1616 the same preacher

compared the "enhancers of estates" to field-briars. "This island of ours, within the last few years, hath bred a great shell; crush that, and you kill him. Say, therefore within thyself, What will become of me and mine if I destroy the nest of breeding Christians (the local commoners in the country), and having chopped them in the pot, seethe old and young in one another's blood."

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PENTECOST †

“There be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit.”—ST. JUDE 19.

THAT which is anti-social, separatist, or sectarian in our kind, according to the apostolic writer is fundamentally anti-spiritual. Socialism, however materialist or “sensual” its temporary manifestations may be, “is born of the Spirit.”

I.

The day of the sending of the Holy Spirit, Whitsun Day, was naturally the birthday of the human-universal society, the Catholic Church. The birthday of the Church was lately asserted by a writer in a German Social Democratic journal, which is now published in London, to have a significance which churchgoers are slow to recognise. He sees in the gathering of Christ's disciples at Jerusalem, and the consequent organisation of this new society, “the first International Working Men's Congress.” I need scarcely tell you that the writer who thus claims the “apostolical succession” for the Social Democrats has renounced all communion with the Church which the apostles founded. He does not believe Jesus to be the Eternal Son of God, the Head of

† Whitsun Day, 1884.

every man, the rescuer and healer of humanity, the giver of the renewing and socialising Spirit for the constitution and education amongst all nations of a human-universal fellowship, the Catholic Church. It is therefore all the more instructive that such a man should confess that the thing which he regards as most hopeful and most healing in the modern world—the International Socialist movement—began, or at least was predicated, on Whitsun Day with the beginning of the Church. The apostles of Jesus were the first internationalist socialists. As I hear a great deal about “Scientific Socialism,” about “Non-Christian Socialism,” as I am told that the thing Socialism must not be damaged by qualifying it with the adjective Christian, I am the more impressed by this unmasked concession of the exiled *Freiheit* that the historical origin of Socialism, the first definite international working-men’s movement was Christian, and was Christian purely. It was not indeed the interest of an undefinable and vague thing called “Christianity,” but it was the Name of the crucified and risen Man, Christ Jesus, which gathered together in one on Whitsun Day the poor and suffering men and women of so many lands and tongues.

II.

“According to the Christian Legend,” said the *Freiheit* on the Whitsun festival of 1879, “A Man appeared on this earth nearly 2,000 years ago who forced the rich and powerful to see that the poor were their brothers, and that the rich had no right to tyrannise over and prey upon the poor. He tore the mask of hypocrisy from the faces of the Pharisees. He sought to bring about equality among men and peace upon earth.” The writer goes on to say, that it is “this bright and

sunny side of the agitation started by Christ which has been at all times popular amongst the poor and needy. Some, at least, amongst the poorest folks have discerned in Christ the God of their own class, and they have been the more confirmed in their faith by hearing that it was the great and mighty of His generation who caused Him to be nailed upon the Cross." As the Master, so were His disciples. They also "were poor fellows, and their gathering at Jerusalem, when Christ was dead, on what the Church calls the Day of Pentecost, may be distinctly characterised as the first International Working Men's Congress." No such gathering of "devout men out of every nation under heaven" had ever before been experienced in the history of humanity. The Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia and in Judæa, in Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, and in the parts of Lybia about Cyrene, and in Egypt, and foreigners of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, are all claimed by the modern Social Democrat as representatives of the labouring class in these various parts. "The people," he says, "trusted the apostles of Christ, and ordered their life and conduct according to their doctrine. Foes and mocking critics said that the apostles and disciples of Christ were drunk, and full of new wine; others opposed them and their movement, and said, 'They are revolutionists, confiscators, dividers of property; they will turn the world upside down.' The preachers of the new doctrine were not merely railed at, but were persecuted; and when persecution availed nothing against the spread of their doctrine, then the rich and ruling classes began to mix themselves up with the movement, and bit by bit falsified the principles of the Church."

I need hardly say to any reader of St. Luke that the assumption of the poverty of all the original disciples of

Jesus is not true to fact. There were rich men amongst them, Joseph of Arimathæa, Barnabas, and others. St. Luke shows that it was the action of the Holy and unifying Spirit upon the wills of the rich amongst Christ's first disciples which made the Christian Socialism of the Church of Jerusalem a practical thing. "All that believed were together, and had all things *common*; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need" (ii. 44, 45). And again, at a later period (iv. 32-37, v. 1-3), "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common. Neither were there any among them that lacked." After "they were all filled with the Holy Ghost" poverty was for a time abolished. "For as many as were possessors of lands, or houses, sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." This wonderful Christian Socialism, so isolated in the world's history, and so short-lived, was *Christian*. It was not the product of outward laws or institutions, but of the Holy Ghost, whom Jesus Christ had sent unto men from the Father, directly working upon the wills of the sons and brethren. So St. Peter implied in dealing with the first instance of resistance to the Holy Ghost in the Church. "Ananias, why has Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?"

It is curious that the preacher of Atheistic Socialism should take his stand upon ground exactly similar to that upon which all the founders of Christian Sects have built their various imaginary "churches." He assumes that there has been a total "apostasy" of the real and

historical Church from that standing (*στάσις*) on which Jesus Christ stood her and from that Spirit with which He inspired her.

All our religious sects are bound logically to assume that a new Pentecost, a new outpouring of the Church-creating Spirit occurred some time, and somewhere, and in some elect persons, in the seventeenth, eighteenth, or nineteenth centuries. Our Sects lay down the new foundation of a modern Independency, an Anabaptism, a Plymouth Brethrenism, or some other opinionative association, as the proper substitute for the apostasised Church; they call upon men and women to come out of the old Babylon and enter into the new Sion which they have built. This Social Democratic preacher would separate socialism from the Church, and make it a sect. He follows in the track of sectaries, and announces a new Whitsun Day, a new gospel, a new apostolate, a new catholic or universal-human society. "We, the Socialists, announce to you to-day," said the *Freiheit* during the Whitsuntide of 1879, "a new doctrine, the doctrine of liberty and equality; we aim to effect the brotherly union of all men in the world. We, however, preach this freedom, equality, and brotherhood not merely in the name of Love, but what is much more significant, in the name of Right. A new Day of Pentecost has dawned. In all tongues and in all lands the same doctrine, the socialist doctrine, the emancipation of all men, is being proclaimed." Some of the new preachers even went so far, after Ferdinand Lassalle's untimely death by his duel in Switzerland, as to proclaim, "Lassalle has died for you. He has given his blood for you." Nay, there were even some who believed that Lassalle had not really died, but only disappeared, and would come again to emancipate the poor and needy from the capitalist and the

oppressor. True, indeed, as is this Social Democrat's sermon on behalf of his new sect, as a substitute for the Son of Man's fundamentally Socialist Church, I take leave to say that his own application of the facts of Whitsun Day, the birthday of Christ's Church, is a proof that there is no need of a new sect, but rather of a penitent return of the Church to the principle with which the Holy Ghost inspired her.

III.

You expected to-day to hear a priest of Christ's Church preach a Whitsun Day sermon, and he has asked you to listen to some extracts from a Whitsun Day article written by one who calls himself an "Atheistic Socialist." To some Christian hearers his sermon may seem very dreadful. To me, I confess, it seems very hopeful, and even to be more Christian than many a sermon I have heard from Christian preachers. I cannot say how much I learned from it five years ago, when I first read it. Its half-unwilling and half-unconscious confession that if modern nations and men are to be redeemed from the evils which now oppress them, the Son of Man must die for them, a new society for all nations must be founded, a gospel of universal brotherhood must be preached to "all nations" and to "every creature," strengthened my faith in the great assertion of St. Peter on this day, that Jesus, the Son of God and the Son of Man, the Head of Humanity, had poured out His Spirit "upon all flesh." Here is a man, one of that flesh, who quarrels with Christ's Church for apostatising from her own original principle—from the faith once delivered to the saints. But when he comes to state the Church's original principle, the faith once delivered—as he sees it—what does he find it to be?

Exactly such a principle as the Social Democrat longs to see established in all lands ; exactly such a faith as the Social Democrat is exhorting all poor and suffering men to hold, if they would be saved, or care for mankind's salvation. He accuses the Church of having apostatised from the foundation on which she was built up by the apostles—that brotherhood and equality of the rich and the poor, the master and the slave, the ruler and the ruled. He sees that the Church has apostatised from the doctrine communicated to her by the Holy Ghost, that possession is not property. He holds that a new Pentecost, a new gospel, a new apostolate, a new confession are now needed, because the Church has not effected that which Christ planned, and for which His apostles laboured and suffered. He tries to show that there is some difference between the new "church" of Karl Marx and the Church of the Son of God—wholly to the preference of the former—in that the apostles of Christ proclaimed universal brotherhood in the name of "Love," while the apostles of Marx and Lassalle proclaim universal brotherhood in the name of "Right." But it is certain that in the Gospel "Love" and "Right"—or the fruit of the inward *Spirit* of God and the *Law* of God—are not represented as two differing forces. The day on which the *Spirit* of love was poured forth upon the disciples of Jesus Christ was being kept by them and all the Jews on the day of the giving of the *Law*. The Spirit is given us to enable us to keep the Law ; it is only by love that a man can always and everywhere do Right to all. "Love is the fulfilling of the Law."

The Social Democratic preacher degrades Love and Right into mere things, or mere forces, by disconnecting them with trust in and obedience to the living Spirit. He is fighting in all men against their own selfishness

and hatred, and is inspiring men with their longing to *be* right and to see right everywhere done on earth.

We may proclaim to all men that they are brothers, in the name of Love, or in the name of Right: but this will no more enable them to be brotherly, to forgive their enemies, in the nineteenth century than it did in the first century. Unless we have already been made brothers, unless we *are* brothers, we cannot be made so in Love's, or Right's, or in any thing's name. If we are brothers there must be that in ourselves which witnesses to the reality of our kinship—a brotherly Spirit who is uniting each to each, is calling each to brotherly conduct; a common Spirit rebuking each and resisted by each when his conduct is merely animal, separatist, "sensual," unbrotherly, or as the apostolic writer says, "having not the Spirit."

But a common spirit in men as brothers, whether it inwardly inspires them to Love, or whether it inwardly orders them to be and do Right, can be nothing else than the spirit of a common and universal Father. Brothers we are not, brothers we never can be, unless the first article of the Catholic Creed—the Faith for "all Nations" and "every creature"—be the first principle of the social and political life of men, unless we all have one Father. To preach to men the miserable tidings, "You have no Father," is surely an odd way of bringing the rich and the poor to believe that they are all brothers: to proclaim to men, "No spirit of the common Father of all men has been given to you," is an odd way of bringing the capitalist and the labourer, the landlord and the commoner, to believe that they have an inward power of regarding one another and behaving to one another as brothers. Every man knows—if he yet quite knows himself—that there is that in him which St. Jude describes as sensual

animal, separating, and unspiritual; he knows that when he lets it rule it makes him capable of every degree of greed, tyranny, and unbrotherliness. You and I know it. It is *that* in us which scorns, or dislikes, or hates, or at last purposely does wrong, to this or that fellow-man. It is in the Social Democrat as well as in the Christian: it is the old Adam which lusts to banish, imprison, crucify or hang the advocates of the poor and needy for asserting they are robbed of the rights which are theirs as the equals and brothers of the rich and powerful. Is it not also the same old Adam which in the day of revolution or judgment refuses to acknowledge a brother in any man who has hitherto not been poor and needy, and which exhibits its belief in universal brotherhood, by fanatically cutting off the head of a brother because he is a king or a capitalist?

Things can do nothing. Love as a thing can do nothing. Right as a thing can do nothing. Christianity as a thing can do nothing. Socialism as a thing can do nothing. But the Spirit, which the Father has given through Jesus Christ to the Church and to mankind, can do everything. We are feeble in ourselves to good, we are powerful in ourselves to wrong, but omnipotent in Him to all good. "I can do all things," said the apostle, "through Christ who strengtheneth me." The Church can do through Him, if she will let Him have His perfect work upon her—and Christ will judge and punish her terribly if she does not—all social and individual good which the Social Democracy wishes to see done, but which as a mere Sect it can never do. "But," exclaims the doubter, who demands a new Pentecost, a new gospel, and a new Church, "the Spirit which Jesus Christ gave the disciples has been at work in the Church and the world for nearly two thousand years, and the social regeneration of humanity seems to

be as far off as ever." The Church declares that the Spirit of God has not only been at work in her, but at work in every one, in you—that He has been and is urging you to live as a son of the eternally Good and Right, and as a brother of every man with whom you come into contact or conflict. The Spirit has been doing this for twenty, thirty, fifty, perhaps, seventy years. What has this Spirit as yet effected in me and in you? Are you, am I, much less selfish, sensual, separatist; much more brotherly, social, spiritual now than you and I were twenty years ago?

CHRIST UNITING HIS CHURCH TO THE STATE, AND ENDOWING HIS CLERGY

“Into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house! And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again. And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you: and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.”—ST. LUKE x. 5-9.

IN this portion of His charge to the seventy the Lord has established for all times and all places the principle of the Union of His Church with the pre-existing forms of secular society—domestic, civic or parochial, and national. In it also He asserts, as a part of His Gospel, the principle of the establishment and endowment of His clergy. It is a fit text for St. Luke's Day, not simply because it occurs in the Eucharistic Gospel of the festival, but because the record of the mission of the seventy is found only in this Gospel, and because it is characteristic of the document which is peculiarly the Gospel of the Nations. The Jews held that Humanity had been divided and organised by God in seventy, or seventy-two, Nations. It is also a fit text for the present day, in which it is being loudly pretended that Christ and His clergy as such have no proper relation to the forms in which God has providentially

moulded secular society, to households, parishes, and states; but that a family, a city, or a nation, as such, lies somewhere outside the Kingdom of God and His Christ. A comparison in detail of the likeness and the difference between the Lord's earlier mission of the twelve apostles and the later mission of the seventy disciples would be instructive; but I cannot pause to attempt so great a task now, because I have so much to say—much more indeed than I can hope to say—upon this section of His charge to the seventy.¹

I.

Jesus, as the Head of Humanity and the reconciler of estranged men and estranged societies to their Father and their fellow-men, sent out His seventy disciples, first (as the fifth verse says) to households. He sent them secondly (as the eighth verse says) to cities. The general object of their mission, so far as it personally concerned them and their own time and nation, was to prepare Israel for His own coming. He "sent them, two and two, into every city and place whither He Himself would come." Their sending was the summons, from Him who stands at every door and knocks, from the Head of each Jewish family, from the Ruler of each Jewish parish, asking it freely to open its doors to Him, to unite itself with His universal human Church, and devote itself and its property to the service of the Father and the brethren.

The Lord gave the seventy no brilliant promise. On the contrary, He told them that they would find themselves to be inadequate, as to number and as to labour, for the work which had to be done. "Therefore said

¹ The mission of the twelve is given by St. Luke (ix. 1-6), St. Mark (vi. 7-11); but with greater fulness by St. Matthew (xi. 1-42).

He unto them, the harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth labourers into His harvest." He repeated to the seventy what He had already said, almost in the same words, to the twelve apostles. "Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way." The former of these two counsels was His first indication that it was not a part of His plan that His bishops and clergy should spend the most part of their time and powers in the mere earning of their living, by fishing, or tent-making, or school-mastering, or journalism, or literature, still less in scheming how to escape all such work by the getting what we in England mammonishly call a "living." The latter part of His counsel, "Salute no man by the way," indicated the eagerness, speed, absorption of mind with which they were to make straight for that one object to which He directed them.

There was indeed to be no salutation before they reached that object: but it was to be otherwise when it was reached. "Salute no man by the way": but "into whatsoever household ye enter," salute it: "First say, Peace be to this house." This is the salutation which the Church bids the priest to use "first of all," at his visitation of the sick in every household. "When any person is sick," says the rubric, "notice should be given to the minister of the parish: who, coming into the sick person's house, shall say 'Peace be to this house, and to all that dwell in it.'"

"Salutation," the Latin word for kindly and courteous greeting, it is worth remembering, has the very same thought at its root as the word "Salvation." It comes from *salus*—"health." It was natural that the Saviour and health-bringer, the maker-whole, the elder brother

of all the households in the world, should approach each family and each city, first of all, with the good news of His eager desire for their outward and inward health. A salutation from Jesus, a greeting from Jesus to any conscience or society, must be an offer of salvation—of that health and wholeness to which the conscience or the society can alone return by owning its kinship to Him, and by submitting to be informed and governed by His Holy and whole-making Spirit.

Christ's salutation to men, through the mission of the apostles and disciples to whom He entrusts it, is not to be thought of as loose, haphazard, or spasmodic in action. He, as Saluter and Saviour of Humanity, sends His bishops and clergy directly to those organic fellowships into which the Father has already constituted Humanity. Christ's "twelve" and Christ's "seventy" are to go to men not as to mere individual units, but as to members of the already existing provinces of the Kingdom of God—to the household and to the city. "Salute no man by the way." Do not stop at the chance, self-isolated individual. Pass by him who is self-separated from his fellows. Go straight to men as I have made men, as members one of another. Your function is domestic—salute ye the household (*οικια*). Your function is political—salute ye the city (*πολις*).

The Son of God insisted (first of all, as the evangelist tells us) that it belongs to the mission of His bishops and clergy to acknowledge the household and the city as the divine establishments of His and our Father. He sent them forth to proclaim, first of all, the union of the Church with the family, and the union of the Church with the city and the town (*Stadt* and *Markt*, as Luther has it). We discern here the presage and pledge of the ultimate union of His Church (after the destruction of

Jerusalem and the falling to pieces of the false and forced unity of the Roman Empire), with the greater social organisms of the Nations or States. The union of the Church with the household and family, the union of the Church with the city, town, and parish, was evidently in the plan of Jesus Christ. Since the state or nation is a social organism which God's providence as world-ruler has evolved out of the commune and parish, as He evolves the commune out of the household, it must be a part of the plan of God's Son, and a step towards the fulfilment of the Father's will, for His Church to seek union everywhere with the nation, fatherland, or state.

II.

Jesus is the Judge as well as the Saluter and Saviour of Humanity. Hence He distinguishes between two sorts of households, two sorts of cities. One sort of household and city will "receive" His clergy, and will sustain them so far as it can. Another sort of household and city will "not receive" them. But the distinction between those two classes of households and cities is altogether a moral distinction. It is a difference of their own making, not of God's making. It is the product of the good and bad will of the kinsmen of the household or the burghers of the city towards the Father and the brethren. This distinction is not in the original call and constitution of the social organism of household or city by God Himself. Every family, as God made it, is good. Every city, as God congregated it, is good. Therefore—apart from the moral character which the domestic or political society may itself afterwards exhibit, apart from the welcome or rejection with which it meets the salutation and salvation of the Son of God—His apostles and disciples are to approach

every household as already God's family, every city as already God's congregation. "Into *whatsoever* household ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house." Any and every household, any and every commune in the world, any and every nation or state, is assumed by Jesus, quite apart from its conversion and obedience to Him or its union with His Church, to be a divine fellowship, a family and city of the Father, the social product of His humane providence, a province of His kingdom. For this reason it behoves Him who comes to men in the Father's name to send His salutation to it. Therefore Jesus, the Elder Brother, commissions His bishops and clergy in all ages to greet the members of every household as His brethren and sisters. Therefore the Christ, the King whom the Father has anointed, sends his apostles and disciples to call the burghers of every commune to live as fellow-citizens with Him. The mission of bishops and clergy is to proclaim to each social organism what it is in the idea of God, how magnificent its character is, what a vocation from God and what a work for men belongs to it. He sends us, as He goes on to say, "to heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." There is a sickness in every conscience, household, parish, and nation until it knows, accepts, and acts upon the glad tidings concerning itself which Jesus sends to it by His Church. The Church holds, by the gift of the Son of God and Son of Man, the one valid tradition and the one only perfect ideal of personal manhood; the tradition and ideal of the family; the tradition and the ideal of organic neighbourhood; the tradition and the ideal of nationality; the tradition and the ideal of humanity.

Christ's apostles and disciples were thus ordered to recognise and proclaim the divine character of every

household and every city. The sectary or separatist regards a household, a city, or a state, as such, as mere parts of "the world," and consequently asserts that "the Church," whatever he may mean by it, ought not to be in union with them, but rather in opposition to them. Hence his "Church" is not parallel with the "congregation" which God has already gathered together as one family, one parish, one fatherland; but it is an aggregation of individuals whom he has induced to separate themselves from the divine, real and necessary "Congregation." "Into whatever *household* (*οικια*) ye enter, first say, Peace be to this *house*" (*οικος*). The one "house," or material building, is a symbol of the oneness of the social "household," or family. In the fellowship of kinsfolk and servants, "in the lively stones," as St. Peter has it, the Master-builder and Father of all, who has brought them together by nature and providence, sees the indivisible oneness of a house which He has built. Every household has a oneness in Christ, and under Christ, of which His Spirit makes its members mindful; but its members may ignore and deny that oneness, and split away each from the other in conduct, character, politics, or religion. In the households of Jewry, to which the Lord especially sent forth the seventy, they may have found one member to be a Pharisee, another to be a Sadducee, another to be an Herodian, another to be a fellow-disciple, as we now find in households one to be a Papist, another to be a Wesleyan, another a Secularist, another in every sense a Catholic. The individual members of a household, the individual citizens of a city, may think they ought to break from God's congregation, and individually aggregate themselves into separatist houses, separatist cities. But the apostles and the seventy, according to the commandment of the Lord, must ignore the schisms

and separations which the members of a household or the parties of a city themselves originate, and must address them one and all as an indivisible social unity which the Father has established. The Church of Christ does not correspond to Christ's ideal and plan, nor to the facts of nature and providence, by establishing a union with an individual or a group here and there, but only by establishing a union with the household as a whole, with the city as a whole, and with the nation or state as a whole. The union of Church and State is an integral part of the Gospel of Christ. He sent forth His apostles and disciples with the mission of uniting His Church in all ages and places with the household, the parish, and the state, which are also His.

III.

I have spoken so long upon one aspect of the Salutation which Jesus sent to households and cities by the seventy, that I shall be obliged to say much less than I intended upon the next clause of His commission. He warned them that some households and cities would reject His Salutation, and refuse to be in union with His Church. But other households and cities would gladly receive them. As to such He commanded, "In the same household remain, eating and drinking such things as they give, for the labourer is worthy of his hire." Again, "And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat and drink such things as are set before you."

Here we see Jesus Christ Himself, as the Head over all things to His Church, not only solemnly and deliberately *establishing*, but solemnly and deliberately *endowing* His clergy. The germ of every subsequent parochial or national establishment and endowment lay

in this daring charge of the poor and property-less Son of Man. "In that same household," He said, "remain ye"; that is, "Establish yourselves in that household, without hesitation or misgiving. The household, as well as the apostolical brotherhood, is My Society. The city, as well as the Church, is put by the Father of humanity under Me." In the Person of Christ Jesus, the Church and the State, the ecclesiastical and the civil, what is eternal and what is secular in humanity, are mediated and united. He does not obliterate the distinction, but He insists upon the union, of Church and parish, of Church and State. In obedience to Jesus Christ's charge, in the full conviction of Christ's rights as Lord over all human societies, the apostles established the Church in the cities of the Roman Empire. In the same faith His later missionaries established the Church amongst the communes and the nations out of which the modern States of Europe have been developed by God's world-government.

But the Lord was not content with commanding His clergy to establish themselves within the organic forms which His Father had given, or might give, to secular society. "Remain," He said, "eating and drinking such things as they give." "And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you." As the Head and Ruler of both societies He assumes the right to take the shelter and food of His families, His cities, and His states—at least of those of them which "receive" His apostles and His disciples willingly—and therewith to endow His clergy. "Accept these endowments," He said to the seventy, "without hesitation or misgiving; know and preach that I have a right to them." He claimed jurisdiction in every household and every city to which He sent His salutation and salvation. The rudimentary endowments

of shelter and provision which the seventy received during their mission were not to be regarded by them as gratuities to themselves, but as debts due to the Lord Jesus Christ. He claimed and claims to be the eternal Householder, the abiding *οικοδεσποτης* of every family, parish, and state. His very last missionary act before His Passion, the object of His very last sending forth of apostles, was the assertion of His right. "The Lord hath need of them," was all which the apostles were to say, as they loosed the ass and the foal. St. Peter and St. John were sent to demand as His right the temporary endowment of His Church with the guest-chamber in Jerusalem for the celebration of the last Passover and the first Eucharist.

It is important to recollect, amidst the controversies now in front of us, that Jesus Christ—being the Head of the secular as well as the ecclesiastical society—has guarded and vindicated in His charge the rights and liberties of His families, parishes, and states against all undue encroachment and greed of His clergy. The seventy were forbidden to force themselves upon unwilling houses and unbelieving cities, or to demand more than enough from the willing. Not only so, but He proclaimed, as the principle of His establishment and endowment, that "The labourer is worthy of his hire." By this He not merely liberates His clergy from all hesitation in accepting a sufficiency of shelter, food, and other stipend, but He reminds His clergy that every one who would have "hire" must be a "labourer." Labour is that which Christ's secular societies—household, parish, or state—have a title from Christ to demand of all the clergy to whom they give shelter, food, or any sort of stipend. The state, the city, and the family have a right from the Son of Man Himself to regulate endowments and to disestablish and dis-

endow every clerical idler. It is against the law of Christ that a land-owning and purse-owning "patron"—a caricature of the true *Father*—should have the power of forcing any idler whom he pleases upon Christ's households and parishes. He condemns it by His principle that "the labourer is worthy of his hire," and by His inference that the "hire" is given or withheld by the Society.

BREAD: THE GIFT OF GOD TO THE WHOLE NATION †

“ She had heard in the country of Moab how that the Lord had visited His people in giving them bread.”—RUTH i. 6.

BREAD is almost the cheapest gift which can be given. The professional tramp, whose lust is for money rather than bread, often throws the gift away as useless. I find it more easy to condemn his waste, as every other idler's waste, than to condemn him. The tramp is a man: therefore, as the Son of God says, he does not “live” by “bread alone.” He craves for what is humane or spiritual; and he knows that he can get for a little money what mere bread will not give him—an hour of club-life in the warm and social tavern on the roadside. It is hard to grudge him so short an episode of brightness, since his life as a whole is cold and joyless enough, compared with the lives of richer tramps, who can rest in grand hotels instead of barns or hedges, but who possibly do not excel him in their reverent esteem for mere bread.

I.

Throughout the Bible, as in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, this cheapest and meanest of gifts is set forth as the symbol, the evidence, and the very vehicle of

† Sermon preached at Harrow-on-the-Hill.

God's visitation to men. "The Lord had visited His people in giving them bread." The harvest, as the writer believed, was nothing less than a visit of God to the nation, and so a sign to Israel that it was His own people. All nations had harvests, and so the Hebrew prophets began to perceive what the Gospel afterwards declared, and what was later evidenced by the birth of the Catholic Church on the Day of Pentecost, that every nation must be a people of God. The English harvest of this year is the Lord's visitation of England, and His sign to us that we, as fully as ever Israel was, are His people.

If you would see the harvest of 1888 for our English nation, you must not go only into our English fields, but you must go also along Thames' side and into the docks. The land of England is not so English as it once was. While we have been boasting of our progress in empire, commerce, manufacture, politics, tolerance, culture, and other things—some good, some questionable—our native soil, in the process of our history, has been becoming less and less ours, getting concentrated into the hands of fewer and fewer landowners. It cannot be said to be owned by England as a whole: it is not owned by the parishes as communities. The process of inclosing, or confiscating, lands once common has gone on without a protest from either of the rival political parties which divide the State, and in turn share its profits amongst their chief agents. Neither of them has been free from the sin of giving up to Party what was meant for Mankind. Hence it is that *England* is not yet England's own property, and is not yet used mainly for the production of a harvest for everybody in the land, as it ought to be; but it is largely misused for the production of fortune, pleasure, social predominance, or political power for the few.

Our English harvest is not principally sown and reaped upon English ground, but upon Russian, Hungarian, American, and other foreign ground. We undoubtedly owe God thanksgiving to-day for the strength which He has given to our foreign brethren labouring in their fields, and for the fertility with which He has visited and blessed soils beyond the sea. If there were no land to supply us with bread except our own England—which is not yet completely ours—we English should be starving, or hurrying into bestial savagery, instead of giving thanks. All culture begins and continues through agriculture. Therefore we ought not to forget in our Harvest Thanksgiving that we are depending for our daily bread, for our salvation from famine and from relapse into barbarism, not wholly upon our own labour in our land, but chiefly upon the continuity of peace with our foreign brothers. Our great nation, although it has not lost its old creative genius in art and science, is now forced to live upon charity conditioned by commerce. Rich as we still are in the inventive and discerning spirit, we are beggars for our daily bread, though we beg with money instead of words. The Old Testament ideal is certainly not now realised in our New Testament land: “The Feast of Harvest, the first fruits of *thy labour* which *thou hast sown* in the field, and the feast of ingathering, which is in the end of the year, which *thou hast gathered in thy labours* out of the field.” We have now to buy, at what price the synods or “rings” of Mammon please, that which other peoples have sown, and other peoples gathered, in fields not our own.

It is true that our debt to our foreign brethren has its good side. In the fact that so much of the daily bread of England has again to be fetched in ships from Russia or America, we may see something pentecostal, akin to

the origin and purpose of the humane-universal fellowship, the Catholic Church. It is the Lord's witness, like the sign of tongues on Whitsun Day, that Moab and Israel, Russia and England, are equally His chosen peoples, under the culture of His common Spirit of life and unity, dependent upon one another as fellow-members of that indivisible Humanity of which His Son is the King and Redeemer.

II.

The bankrupt widow Naomi, an emigrant in the foreign land of Moab, "heard in the country of Moab how that the Lord had visited His people"—that is, her own nation and fatherland Israel—"in giving them bread." A poor, desolate, half-ruined widow is the first actress in this godly drama. For her sake, insignificant as she looks upon the world's gay stage, there is a harvest in Israel. For the sake of such as Naomi, the Lord visits His people in all lands "giving them bread." Is it not the office of His ordained servants to ask whether they are getting what He is "giving them"? A nation's harvest is here called the Lord's visitation: it is a new coming of the Lord to the whole people. He comes again, so to speak, with the people's yearly bread in His hand. Whenever He comes it is as Saviour and Judge. "The harvest," said the Lord to His apostles, "is the end of the world"—"the consummation of the age." A secular harvest is a rehearsal, or is a revelation, of that eternal harvest at which He opens His book and judges the nations, separating them one from another, blessing some and cursing others, according as they have recognised Him, have fed and consoled Him, in the hungry and thirsty, poor and naked, outcast and persecuted, who are inseparable from Him. We ought

to ask ourselves, in the presence of the unseen great white throne, whether it be in any degree our fault, politically and socially, if the Lord does not visit His people in England upon their own soil with bread enough and to spare? We ought to ask ourselves whether it be in any degree our fault that so many of His people—uncomforted Naomis, worse that unwedded Ruths—perish in England for lack of bread? Ought we not in the earth's culture, as in spiritual culture, to be "looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God"? If we are obliged to send to other peoples to buy some of the bread which the Lord has given them, is it because He has given us too little land? Or is it because we are not insisting that the land which He has given us shall be put to the use for which He gave it, shall be made directly profitable to poor Naomis and all His people, and less luxuriously profitable to a very few of them? I am not enough of an expert to say how far our English land, if it were all honestly and piously in use, would support all the English people; but having freshly come from sister-lands—Switzerland, Germany Belgium, and France—I have been struck afresh at the contrast between the exhaustive use which their peoples make of their land, even of their poorest land, and the unthankful and niggardly use which we are making of our own noble land.

The national priest owes it to his Master and his brethren to say that no English parish can hold an ideal harvest festival until all English land really belongs to all England. We have the example of a noble band of foregoers of our order. From the age of the Tudors to the outbreak of the Civil War, the Anglican episcopate and priesthood were never wanting in men who gave prophetic "testimony before kings"

against the aristocratic land-robbers and church-robbers, although our partisan historians have taken little or no notice of them. I know of no modern sermon more faithful or revolutionary than the appeal of the brave priest, Francis Trigge, to James the First, to be a national king, the champion and tribune of the people, against the puritanical nobles and gentry who were turning arable land into great pastures, perverting the public commons into private parks and gardens, depopulating whole townships, decaying tillage, maintaining obsequious Nonconformist preachers and services in their halls in opposition to the priest of the community in the common parish church. He aptly called his appeal "The humble petition of two poor sisters, the Church and Commonwealth, for the Restoring of their ancient Commons and Liberties, which late Inclosure with Depopulation hath taken away." A national harvest festival, after the splendid type of the Old Testament, must be preceded by the honest nationalisation of the land, and a parish harvest festival by a more complete re-commonalisation of the land than Francis Trigge could demand from Elizabeth or James. Look at the land around our London—where certainty of daily bread is so sore a need, so hard for all to get! Is not the earth "groaning," as the Nations' Apostle said to the Church of Rome, under the present tyranny of the fleshly pomp and vanity, the devilish competition and money-worship, of this wicked world? It is all but exclusively grass land on the north of London, separated from London itself by an ominous fringe of "building land." Caste and Mammon, idle fashion and busy competition, demand prodigious quantities of food for their horses; so the land cannot be spared to grow corn and fruit for English men, women, and children, and wholesomely employ them on its culture. Every

one must own, apart from any socialist or anti-socialist theories—which may be stained by the fallibility and secularity of the mere *Zeitgeist* or age-spirit—that the Eternal Spirit, the Lord of Ages, is now showing us in manifold ways that our land is not yet in the hands which can turn it to the best use, the most national and most humane use. We in London are being punished with a plague of horses. We seem near a realisation of the satirists' imaginary "State" in which men are governed by horses. Even if a thousand fine ladies could bring themselves to be drawn around the Park by one horse instead of two horses, some land would be redeemed to find bread for a thousand hungry sisters. The idle "masher," who is strong enough to go on his own legs like his poorer fellow-tramp, and whose time is of no value to the Commonwealth, might walk instead of dashing to and from his goal in a hansom. In the midst of the Babylonish noise of the horses and wheels of London, as well as in the stillness of the depopulated sheep walk or deer forest, the Word of God in our flesh is still asking, "Is not a man better than a beast?" It is a horror to think of the immense reaches of land perverted from the humane and pious use of "giving the Lord's people bread," and restrained to the breeding of poor beasts and birds, in order that fashion and idleness may prove their heredity from the "noble" savage, and have "something to kill."

III.

If there be something pentecostal, carrying back our thoughts to the beginning of the universal Church, in the character which our national history and development have outwardly given to the modern English harvest, there is an abiding pentecostal character in

the harvest festival itself. We celebrate it in the house of Jesus Christ, who is the Bread of Life—the sustenance of every human spirit, soul, and body. The every-day social life of the Church during her pentecostal days is exhibited to us in the Acts of the Apostles as a sort of continuous harvest festival. Our first fathers and mothers in the Catholic faith and fellowship, “breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness, and singleness of heart.” They recognised the grace and lovingkindness of the world’s Saviour in taking and consecrating the most vulgar need of the world’s life to serve as the symbol and vehicle of the highest and deepest need of the individual and the race—joyful communion with the Eternal Unity, and with one another in Him. Each ordinary meal became to them, as it ought to be to the Christian, a household eucharist, a little harvest festival, a sign that the God of all was visiting them “in giving them bread.” But the exultant faith of the young Church could not confine itself within the household. The Churchman was more than a family man, more than a citizen. He was the member of a body which had been called out to bear witness to the filial relation of every man, woman, and child to the Eternal. The Church’s joyous faith could only outwardly exhibit the fulness of its contents for humanity in one simple form ; it could be satisfied with nothing narrower than that which we now call Socialism. Its socialism was instinctive ; it was prophetic ; it was not scientific. It saw, by the light of the Holy Spirit, that “*our* daily bread” could be nothing meaner than the social gift of God to His “people”—not merely an individual gift to so many persons as could get it, but His gift for “distribution” to every person that “had need.” On the day of Pentecost, as the birthday of the Church,

the Spirit had revealed to the apostles whom Jesus Christ had chosen, the unity and solidarity of man's whole kind in Christ. He had shown them that all languages were holy languages, and that every nation was a people of God. It is an obligation inherited by the bishops whom Christ has sent to the nations, by the priests whom He has sent to the communes, to insist by word and deed that the Lord's peoples everywhere shall get in its fulness that which the Lord is "giving them—Bread."

THE APOSTOLIC FUND IS NOT SILVER AND GOLD BUT THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST OF NAZARETH †

“Silver and gold have I none : but such as I have give I thee : in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk.”—Acts iii. 6.

THE episode of the healing of the lame beggar at the gate of the Temple holds an important place, historically and doctrinally, in the life of the Church. It is “the beginning of miracles” in the work of Christ’s body, the Church, like the turning water into wine in Christ’s own work. It is the first of the recorded “Acts of the Apostles” after the definite formation and equipment of the Church. It is the earliest explanation of Pentecost, otherwise than by preaching, to a man outside the Church. It is the first preaching of the Gospel to an individual soul and body. St. Peter’s short saying is the first apostolical orientation of the right position of the new universal-humane Society, and particularly of the rulers of that Society, towards silver and gold and bank-notes.

I.

A few words concerning the apostolical saying, and especially the negative half of it, may be not unprofitable upon a day when the successor of the

† Fifth Sunday after Easter, 1889 (Bishop of London’s Fund).

apostles in the Church of London is asking all his congregations to give him alms for the healing of the thousands of lame souls and bodies at the gate of the Temple, in the hope that they may enter with the apostles, and the healed beggar, into the Temple at the hour of prayer, "walking, and leaping, and praising God."

The circumstances differ. It is the successor of the apostle who asks the Church for alms that he may give them, in the shape of clergy and churches, to the successors of the lame beggar. It is not the successor of the lame beggar who to-day asks the apostle for alms, and gets something better. The London successors of the lame beggar in Jerusalem, the poor, as they make their cries articulate, do not seem to be asking for apostles, bishops, priests, temples, or services. Neither do they now openly ask for an alms. He whom "God hath exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour," has so used the ruling and liberating power given Him in heaven and on earth, as to change the old cry for an alms into the new cry for justice and right from apostles and from all in any authority. Justice and right can at once be given to those at the gate of the Temple, so far as apostles can give it, less completely by giving them more clergy and more services, than by giving back to them, after the precedent of the apostles in Jerusalem, the full and free election of the deacons and priests who are to serve God and them in the new temples.

Oh that the Bishops of England, whom we honour and obey as the successors of Christ's apostles, would say to His now lame and beggared congregations in their dioceses, "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk! Be new and strong men in Christ! Be yourself the Church as you are fast becoming the

State. Do not content yourselves with being mere Church-goers. Make full use of the spirit of counsel and the spirit of government conferred upon you as members of the body of Christ."

May it not be because the successors of the apostles now have "silver and gold"—the subsidy and approbation of the rich—that they do not now say to the successors of the lame beggar, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk?" The successors of the apostles, not only in our Church, but in almost all the national Churches of Christendom, age after age, have been allowing Mammon's moneyed and landed "patrons" so called, because they give, or their ancestors gave, "silver and gold," to despoil Jesus Christ of Nazareth's moneyless and landless lame beggars of their most sacred function and ministry, their share in the government of His congregation and in the election of its officers. It is our great hope and prayer that some day a Bishop of London, following the example of the holy apostles in Jerusalem, will go to the much "murmuring" (Acts vi. 1) folk of the parishes in East London, "call the multitude of the disciples unto him," and say: "Brethren, look ye out amongst you," not only churchwardens and sidesmen, and singers, but deacons and priests, "of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." For the choice of all the clergy is given by the Head of the Church to all His people, but the ordination of the chosen to His apostles. The first Bishop of London who thus follows St. Peter will give to the lame beggars "power and healing in the name of Jesus Christ, of the despicable Nazareth." Such a miracle cannot be wrought by millions of Mammon's silver and gold.

II.

The English national episcopate is certainly now "fastening" its gaze upon the wretched and pauperised in England, and saying: "Look on us." The fund for which your offerings are asked is our diocesan repetition, in a modern manner, of St. Peter's solemn invitation. May we add that the invited in our great cities, whose case is so desperate, give "heed unto them expecting to receive something of them"?

Silver and gold have I none. Neither as yet had the Church much. But it had enough. An apostolic fund, or a fund for the bishopric of Jerusalem, had been already formed, as we learn from the foregoing chapter. "All that believed were together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need." There is no escape from the position that, in the bright morning glow of the full enlightenment of the Holy Church by the Holy Ghost, it was the Catholic or universal faith—the first conviction of the Christian conscience—that it was a thing monstrous and unseemly for any individual Christian to be rich.

St. Peter says that there was no endowment of the apostolate. "Silver and gold have I"—apostle as I am, and charged with such wide cares for spirit and body—"none." The sense has never been wanting, in any age of Christendom, that it is not quite a decent thing for a bishop, as a successor of the apostles, to be a rich man. The deepest thinker in the English episcopate of the eighteenth century, Bishop Butler, was once suddenly asked to give help to some needy man or cause. Calling his steward, he said, "How much ready money have I in the house?" "A hundred pounds, my

lord." "What a shame," exclaimed the prelate, "for a bishop to have such a heap of money." He looked upon the wealth of the bishopric as belonging to it, and not personally to himself; and so convinced were his kinsfolk of his way of looking at it, that they never expected, like the kinsfolk of other bishops, to get any share out of the episcopal property after the bishop's death.

Pampered wits, overpaid statesmen, idle spendthrifts, rich satirists, and capitalist journalists, as well as poor men, take much delight in shooting their arrows at "rich bishops." Let us grant that it is a monstrous thing for a successor of the apostles to be a man of great wealth. But why? Merely because he is a bishop? I can imagine no more ultra-clericalist argument. Is not every layman in the Church a successor of the apostles? Is he not by call and confession Christ's disciple? Did Jesus Christ say to apostles and clergymen only, and to no other Christians, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth"? I should like to see the Gospel in which our journalists and cheap wits have found the texts, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon, if ye be bishops or priests, but if ye be pious railway-directors or philanthropists or theatrical stars, ye can."

Every argument from the New Testament, or from Christian reason or economy, which tells against the great estate and wealth of a bishop, tells with equal force against the much greater estate and wealth of a duke, a banker, a manufacturer, a stock-holder, a tight-rope dancer, a painter, a popular preacher, or a prima donna—if these rich persons profess to be Christ's disciples. Nay, if a bishop conscientiously spends his endowment, as the apostles distributed the endowment of the Church of Jerusalem, or as Bishop

Butler spent the property of the See of Durham—if he leaves to his own kindred none of the money belonging to the Church and the poor—he may exhibit a clearer title to his estates and riches, in my judgment, than most of those to whom a journalist or dissipated satirist never grudges the heap of silver and gold which they spend upon feasting, drinking, revelling, gambling, horse-racing, or operas.

III.

You see that we have opened an inexhaustible subject, as indeed we always must do when we follow one of the pregnant sayings of Christ's apostles, and try to bring it into line with our own moral and social life. Two correlative facts—what money can do, and what money cannot do—continually present themselves to us in the personal and public experience of all men.

I. What silver and gold can do none of us need to be told. Every circular which the post brings us, every secretary and treasurer of a benevolent movement, as well as every pulpit, keeps us informed of the miracles which remain undone only because the would-be doers of them have not enough "silver and gold." Yet a world without money, except as an archæological curiosity in its museums, as a late novelist has ingeniously shown us, is quite conceivable. If silver and gold could do *no* good, the apostles would not have encouraged the propertied Christians of Jerusalem to sell their lands and possessions, and devote all their individual goods to social uses. To withhold money, on the plea that it is not so profitable as grace, is a turning of the grace of God into lasciviousness. Give silver or gold, but recollect how little you are

giving, and how inferior a part of the divine and humane work it can effect.

2. What silver and gold cannot do we need to be always afresh reminded. It is a lesson which the conscience and the Church may have learned again and again by heart, and yet by the drift and colour of our lives, or by the occurrence of unforeseen necessities, may again and again forget. The chief necessity of the Church, as "this beginning of miracles" in the Church and the apostle's saying imply, is always within her reach and at her call—because "the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth" is always within her reach and at her call. The first and great need of an apostle for the healing of the spiritually or secularly lame and beggared is not "silver and gold," which duchesses and bankers have, and which he has to cajole or frighten them into giving. An apostle's first need, and every bishop's first need, is the bold and immediate use of that which he already has, but which Dives does not value at a farthing—Jesus Christ's wonder-working name and Word. "Such as I have give I thee; in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk!" When the great theologian St. Thomas Aquinas, who had renounced his aristocratic title and his property to serve Christ and the poor in the Dominican order, was at Rome, the Pope showed him the luxurious splendour and wealth of the pontifical palace. "You see, Thomas," he said, "Peter cannot now say, 'Silver and gold have I none.'" "Neither can he now say," replied the saint, "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk!" The supreme need of the beggars, lame from their birth, the millions who are born and bred into disease and pauperism, in all our populous cities, is not silver and gold, but apostles—a poor Peter and John. The whole world has lately been observing how one poor Belgian,

following the steps of the Holy apostles—a Father Damien—has done in our age with little or no money, but with such as he had, with the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, spiritual and secular wonders such as the Pope, the cardinals and the bishops of all churches cannot do with their funds of silver and gold.

JESUS CHRIST THE SUPREME RITUALIST

“And He taught saying unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? But ye have made it a den of thieves.”—ST. MARK xi. 17.

THE event which the Holy Gospel records held so great a place in the earliest conceptions of the life and work of Jesus that all the four Gospels contain a notice of it. It was evidently the belief of the first Christians that the act was twice repeated by the Lord. It has never ceased, from their day to ours, to exercise a powerful effect upon the Christian imagination and conscience. It was the first and the only direct and active interference of Jesus in the public life both of the Church and of the State. We cannot fail to see that He here at least allowed the multitude to proclaim Him in the streets as the King of Israel, with no regard to Cæsar’s authority; and that He here, without consultation of the leaders of the people or care for the established authority of the priesthood, asserted a right to act with authority, though He was not of Levi’s tribe, in the Temple of God. Like David, Solomon, Josiah, Hezekiah, the regal constructors and reformers of the Temple and the public worship—of whom the excited people were thinking as His predecessors—Jesus, of the tribe of Judah, showed Himself to be more priestly than the priests.

This amazing interference of Jesus in the Temple struck at two superstitions, as fashionable among us moderns as among those ancient Jews, one social, the other religious. It contained the eternal political declaration of the King and Reformer of the world against that age's and this age's notions of the inviolability of all that is called property. It contained the eternal religious sermon of the High Priest of every conscience against that age's and this age's superstitious delusion that God, as He is a Spirit, can have no care for what is material, outward, symbolical, secular, or ritual in the conduct and manner of His common social worship.

I.

Twice in the course of to-day's ¹ Gospel our attention is forced toward the first of these two points. The Gospel opens with a startling preliminary hint how Jesus regards, and how He deals with, the "sacredness of property." Wherever and whenever He comes in power as the world's King and Reformer, there will be a questioning and a crisis of "property." Every great political and social shaking of the people is nothing less, if the Gospel be true, than an advent of Jesus as the Christ to the holy city of that people. He sent forth two of His disciples to take for His use an ass and a foal, the property of some unknown owners. The disciples were to loose the beasts, and lead them to Him, giving no further reason for their strange interference with other men's possessions, than the blunt message "The Lord hath need of them." It is useless to debate whether the owners of the two beasts were already disciples of Jesus. The Gospel is the product of the Church; it

¹ First Sunday in Advent.

only knows Jesus, as the Church confesses Him, as absolutely "the Lord"—the Lord who is Owner of all, the Lord whose Word reaches every conscience and enlightens every reason. We know that there is that in us which tell us that nothing we possess is our own. We should know this, sooner or later, even if there were no Gospel. The Gospel tells us *whose* these things we call ours, or call property, actually are. "Thou, the owner? Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee, and then whose shall those things be?" You think your outward possessions are yours. Why even your inmost possession, your own soul, is not yours. You have no fixed tenure of it. It was not the outward word of the two apostles to the owners' ears, but the inward word of Jesus Christ to each conscience, which awoke in each this deepest and most abiding conception of the meaning of property—"It is the Lord's." This Word of "the Lord" made them willing, as the fullest and probably the earliest account of the second Gospel says, to "let them go."

The owners were plain, ordinary men, whose property in animals was used in their daily business, whatever it was; it had no pretence to be religious property; yet they were willing to part with them for the use of "the Lord."

II.

Our Saviour's second interference with the rights of "property" at His Advent to Jerusalem was altogether different. "And Jesus went into the Temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the Temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves," "and" (as St. Mark adds) "would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the Temple." In the first

case, the two beasts were probably returned to their owner ; but, in the second case, there is a destruction and confiscation of property, by the coming of the Lord, without any compensation. Here, in a wonderful manner, the only Revealer of God, and the Sender of the Spirit, strikes a double blow at the age's false conceptions of worship, hitting on one side its actual worship, the "covetousness which is idolatry" and which despises all that is not material ; hitting on the other side its superstition of pseudo-spiritualism or anti-ritualism, which despises all that is material. How came all this heap of material property in the Temple of God—the tables of the money-changers, the stalls of the traders in animals? Everything which Jesus at His Advent overturned, and everybody whose property He pitilessly damaged, was there under the pretence of the necessities of the ritual of God's house. "Our property," the traders might have said, "is no secular and worldly matter, like the ass and the foal your disciples have taken from their owners. There is a sacred character about all our property. Everything that we are selling here in the Court of the Nations—the animals, the oil, the wine, the meal, the salt, the incense, and others things, all are wanted by pious souls, who have travelled up to the Holy City from all parts of the earth ; they demand them, and we supply them, in order that they may conscientiously keep the Feast in the Temple of the Lord according to the Law of the Lord. The money-changers are here, in order that the religious pilgrims from foreign lands may get their Greek and Roman and other coins, stamped often with vile, idolatrous emblems, hateful to the one real God, changed into the sacred 'shekel' which can alone be offered to the Lord in His house."

What could be more reasonable, on the surface of it,

than such an explanation of the presence and business of the sellers, buyers, and money-lenders in the outer court of the Lord's house? Neither the scrupulously religious Pharisees nor the critical Sadducees seem to have had the least objection to it. But when Jesus looked at it He condemned it as a desecration of God's house by idolatry, as a singular desecration of the Court of the Nations. The Son of God saw in it the worshipping and serving of property or Mammon, which is the supreme denial of "the Lord" as the Father of all men and the Owner of all things. "And He taught, saying, Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? But ye have made it a den of thieves." He saw the inward and spiritual contents of all this traffic to be "covetousness, which is idolatry," and which is to be testified against as idolatry wherever and in whatever degree His kingdom comes to a people. The religious heads of the Jewish people were of course familiar with the passages from the prophets which Jesus cited; they had doubtless often preached upon them, and had probably explained that they did not condemn this sale and purchase in the Court of the Nations of the ritual necessities of God's public worship.

The official representatives of religion, both the teachers and the clergy, "the scribes and chief priests" (as St. Mark and St. Luke record), when they "heard it," took the side of the traders and usurers against Jesus, "and sought how they might destroy Him."

III.

The men in power, both scribes and priests, were doubtless strict enough supporters of that side of the outward matter of worship which contributed to their

own dignity and their own property. This was the secret bond of union between the vulgar trader and the intellectual scribe, between the half-heathenish money-lender and the orthodox priest. This inclined the religious trafficker not to be hard upon the material traffickers. The scribes and priests could pardon those ritual offences which the Son of God so wrathfully condemned—the buying and selling in the Temple, the carrying of burdens through the Temple. “God,” they would say, quoting Bible texts, “looks upon the heart. We need not think that He can take offence at these mere outward things.” But, as the Lord has already told them, they used a quite different speech about the outward things related to worship, where their own honour or their own profits were concerned. They paid, and they insisted upon the payment of tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin. It was the first article of the Pharisee’s brag in the Temple, “I pay tithes of all that I possess.” It was no scandal to him to see the Temple swarming with traffickers and usurers. So have we seen in later history, that the most bigoted anti-sacerdotalists of all times and places, when they have found themselves in a sacred office, have demanded the most rigid payment of their tithes or other ecclesiastical dues. The Nonconformist and Separatist preachers who were intruded upon the English parishes under the Long Parliament, and under Cromwell’s Empire, declared on Sundays that they were not priests, but clamoured on Mondays to the magistrates to imprison the Quakers for refusing to pay them the tithe allotted by the unrepealed law to the priests. The expulsion of the national episcopate and priesthood brought in a rampant and greedy Nonconformist and Separatist “clericalism,” such as the nation had never before seen or known, and which goes far to explain the severity of its Act of Uniformity.

But that which Jesus asserted at His Advent in Jerusalem, by His wrathful cleansing of the house of God—the real sacredness and importance of the outward and secular side of God's common and national worship, its symbol and ritual, as a common and universal property—had for the Pharisee or Puritan no meaning. These Jewish Puritans, who sought to destroy the Son of Man, like the Puritans and Manichæans of all ages, had lost all conception that the Temple was held in trust for all the peoples—not “the people” or Jewish Church, but “the peoples” or all nations—though it was the main part of the inherited tradition of their race, and though its symbol and ritual were to serve as the alphabet for the spiritual education of the nations in the Kingdom of Christ, in the world to come.

When our English Pharisees in the seventeenth century filled St. Paul's Cathedral with shops and stalls, and perverted the fund, which Archbishop Laud had collected from all England for its restoration, to the enrichment of the great Nonconformist aldermen and councilmen, they had no conception that they were guilty of sacrilege. “God,” said they truly, “dwelleth not in temples made with hands.” “Therefore,” asked they, “is it not better that all this waste land, stone, timber, and money should be employed in adding to the comfort of ‘His saints,’ who have laboured for His cause, than be perverted to the encouragement of idolatry and superstition?”

The outward sanctification of the Temple is to the whole of the earth's space what the outward sanctification of the seventh day is to the whole of the world's time. Every poor shopman who puts up his shutters with glad relief on Saturday, every poor woman who puts on her best dress on Sunday, has to thank the Lord, the Son of Man, for the liberation and the delight.

The Lord's ritual act has the deeper meaning for us because it was *our* place in the old Jewish Temple, the Court of the Nations, the most prophetic part of the building, which was the scene of it, and because His great ritual act was a judgment beforehand against that false worship which is the peculiar temptation of the modern nations—"covetousness, which is idolatry." The argument of the puritanical old man in the Jew and the Christian against the ritual judgment of the Son in His Father's house is put so often in the Son's own words, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in truth," that we are easily blinded to the falsehood and wrong which the old man deduces from His words. "God is a Spirit: therefore we will dwell in our ceiled houses, and let the house of God go bare. God is a Spirit: therefore we will break down all the carved work of God's house, and decorate our own houses with it. God is a Spirit: therefore we will heap up all the treasures of art and the products of man's genius and skill into our palaces and clubs and villas. God does not dwell in a house; He is independent of all our earthly and human splendours: He can be in need of nothing. Let us therefore take to ourselves all that we can."

It is this inveterate Manichæism, this parody of spirituality, this self-seeking Puritanism of the old man in all ages and peoples, which the Lord judged and condemned as thievery and sacrilege at His Advent into the Temple. The act was an application to the future common worship of the nations, of the same principle which He had asserted at the opening of His ministry, when He said: "Consider the lilies of the field," and "Not one sparrow is forgotten before God," and "The very hairs of your head are all numbered."

That the unseen Father of men, the ultimately Real One, cannot be careless about the minute and the scrupulous and the superficially insignificant in His material kingdom, was a part of the theology of the Son's first public preaching. The same principle which He there asserted to be true of the individual flower, bird, and man here in His last great public act he extends to that which is minute, scrupulous, and seemingly insignificant in the material house of God. The Temple, the church of wood or stone, is so sacred in the Son of Man's plan, because it is the standing witness that men are more than individuals, more also than citizens of nations. The Father's house was given, and it still maintains, so singular a distinction, to keep men in mind that their spiritual education as children and brethren calls for a public, uniting, or common worship. What sermon preached within St. Paul's Cathedral can be compared to that sermon which generation after generation its great dome goes on preaching to all London, and to those who daily flock to London from all parts of the earth? If the supreme work of a man is to save his own selfish soul, then it matters little whether the house of God be defiled or clean. Indeed, there is then no great need of any outward house of God at all, since His house is not to be called the house of the individual soul, but "the house of all the peoples." But no man does save his own soul so long as he is careless about all souls, or is content that any other soul should be lost. If the Church be our house, two things follow—first, that we are but a sect, whatever great titles we put upon ourselves; next, that we may do as we like to it and with it. The material house of God differs from all other houses in this, that it belongs, and every act and detail in it should be made to belong, as really to those who

are absent from it, as to those who are present in it. Therefore its central act must ever be, and all its details must concentrate around that which is common, Catholic, or universal-human in worship, around that which is as much the concern of all the peoples outside the temple as of the people within—the “full perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.”

THE SIGHT OF GOD THE SOURCE OF ENDURANCE UNDER WRONG †

“This is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully.”—I PETER ii. 19.

WE read in the Holy Gospel for Easter Day how St. Peter and St. John went into the empty tomb of Jesus, and how first the one, and then the other “saw and believed.” More and more of the endless contents of that sight and that belief were opened to them, as the text shows, in their later experience, by the Spirit that quickeneth. It is no doubt on account of this early Easter companionship, and the new sight and new belief which they then and there shared, that the Church has coupled them together as Epistoler and Gospeller to-day, and will couple them again next Sunday. They saw and believed, as they both say to-day, what Jesus had meant when He called Himself the Good Shepherd. They saw that He had left the grave, as He had gone into it, for man’s sake. They saw all men also in a new character; whether “going astray” or whether “in the fold,” whether owning Christ as their Shepherd, or ignorant of their relation to Him, since they were men, they were Christ’s sheep. “For ye,” says St. Peter to the Church, “were as sheep going astray: but

† Second Sunday after Easter, 1890.

are now (as sheep) returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." And St. John records the Shepherd's words to the "little flock" of apostles which He had gathered in His fold: "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also must I bring." His disciples were the first-fruits and the pledges of His ownership and pastorate of all mankind.

St. Peter tell us, in these first words of the Epistle, three amazing things which he and his fellow-apostle saw and believed, after they had descended in doubt and dread into the tomb of Jesus, and come out of it in hope and faith. They did not, indeed, understand all they saw at the time they saw it, as I have already said. It may take the whole of our life to make us understand but a part of the things which we learnt in our childhood. "I have had much experience," said a French statesman upon his death-bed, "and it has taught me in the end that nothing is altogether true except the catechism."

The first sight was a man "suffering wrongfully": the second was a man enduring the grief forced upon him by this suffering "for conscience towards God": the third, and not the least wonderful, was faith as well as sight. They "saw and believed" the Almighty God thanking a feeble man for what he endured and suffered.

I.

I need not say how full the world is of wrongful suffering. There has never been an age in which the conscience has been so keenly aroused as it is in our age to the hideous universality of suffering and to the perception of wrong as the cause of suffering. If we could catechise every man who is in grief, we should find that in most cases he would indicate some wrong—done perhaps by himself, but probably done by others

—as the origin of it. It is the testimony of all men that these two things are inseparable ; that they are related as cause and effect ; that wherever one is, there the other must be. The inventors of Social Utopias represent suffering, or the defect of sufficient comfort, as the source of evil : the prophets and apostles of God declare that sin, or the want of conscience towards God, is the source of suffering. Even Christ, “who did no sin,” says St. Peter, in this Epistle, “His own self bare our sins.” The Utopist predicts that universal comfortableness would produce universal justice and goodness, or at least he hopes that it would produce a goodness almost universal ; the apostle proclaims that universal righteousness—“the Kingdom of God and its righteousness”—is the first thing which a man has to seek, whether its next results be comfort or suffering.

Meanwhile, neither goodness, justice, nor freedom from suffering are yet universal. The apostle, coming back to the world from the empty tomb of the risen Shepherd and Saviour, sees the world as it is. The grief is already here, the suffering is in the world, and is likely for a long time to be, and likely in millions of cases to be undeserved and wrongful. St. Peter saw cruel tyrants seize upon their fellow-men, buy and sell them, revile them, scourge them, crucify them, kill them. The question then becomes an instantly practical one, such as we cannot meet with a new philosophical or a new social theory, to be realised perhaps in some distant year when we and our suffering neighbours are dead.

St. Peter, as we see from the eighteenth verse, was speaking here to those who were in the very lowest and most degraded social condition in the Roman Empire—to servants, probably to slaves. Their masters and owners might have said their suffering was legal ; the

apostle, having sight of a higher law, says it was wrongful. It was his business, as a pastor of souls, to give them what they needed, something for the actual moment, and not some promise of a dim and distant future. "It is a law of organic nature that no fruitful change of environment or condition can be rapidly produced."¹

The first thing the apostle does is to raise their estimation of themselves, and to inspire them with the thought of their social solidarity. He tells them that they are chosen of God, that they are kings, that they are priests: not as mere individuals, but as members one of another. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." All his descriptions of them to themselves are social.

I was talking lately with a good old man, who after seventy years of honest fight, and the death of all his children, had been forced to choose between starvation and the workhouse for himself and his aged wife. There she died; he had come to her funeral, and was trudging his desolate way back to the house which is no home. Would it have been any help to such a man—"enduring grief, suffering wrongfully"—to read him a chapter of Mr. Bellamy's "Looking Backward"? Ought I to have given him the Manifesto of the Communist Party? Should I have told him that a volume of Essays by the Fabian Society would meet his condition better than the Gospel of St. John? In the presence of such a grief—since Christ our Shepherd tenderly cares for every individual sheep, and not merely for the multitudinous general flock—a wholesome Christian scepticism arises in us. We begin to ask whether a Thomas à Kempis is not at least as profound and wide a social healer as a Karl Marx. The suffering world needs both those who

¹ Dr. Lombroso in *Nouvelle Revue* for March 1, 1890.

do not forget the one in their care for the many, and those who do not forget the whole in their care for the part. We see and believe that whatever is said or planned for the social good of all by agnostics and atheists, who tell the sheep that they have no Shepherd, must have been taught them, for all men's sake, by One whom they know not, "whose the sheep are." But direct and immediate helpers of the suffering and wronged one, except where they follow in the crucified and risen Shepherd's footsteps, they are not. Those whom social science cannot help, since life is so short and science is so slow, Christ the "Shepherd and Bishop of souls," can help; He helps them at once. Those whom social science cannot help, because it demands understanding, while they are silly as "sheep," He can help, because, "He is made unto them Wisdom."

II.

What then is the risen Shepherd's counsel, which the apostle brings out of His empty grave for the help of every man who is suffering wrongfully? "Endure grief." "Bear up under" (*ὑποφέρει*; Vulg. *sustinet*) the wrongful attacks. Do not allow them to beat you down, to sting you into reprisals, to deform you into the image of your persecutors.

But this, you may say, is mere Stoicism. Why not? Is Stoicism, any more than Socialism, obliged to be Anti-Christian? The other apostle, who went after Peter into Christ's empty tomb, and there "saw and believed," said that Christ is the true Light who is enlightening every man who comes into the world. Whatever has been thought out by men searching honestly for the light, resolved to follow it, and anxious to use it for the bettering of their kind and of them-

selves, must have a Christian element and inspiration in it, if Christ be "that Light." Whenever a new profitable thought, or advance in science, or social scheme, has broken upon the world, has He not always sent some to claim it as His, or to show what was Christian in it? Thus we used to hear of "Muscular Christianity," in days when many feared it was almost wicked to be athletic. Then we heard of "Christian Socialism," or "Christian Secularism," or "Christian Agnosticism," or "Christian Stoicism." When and where, for instance, does Socialism merit the quality of "Christian"? Whenever and wherever it is at its best and highest, when it does not conceitedly brag that it is scientific, or ignorantly brag that it is atheist, or self-complacently explain that it is only economic. When it is not the product of jealousy, or irritation, or vanity, or malice, or unneighbourliness, or revenge for wrong, but is the product of "conscience toward God," which cannot be sundered, as Christ has told us, from conscience toward our neighbour. Stoicism is to "endure grief" callously out of high disdain, or out of fanaticism, or cynical indifference, or fatalism. Christian Stoicism is to "endure grief, suffering wrongfully, for conscience toward God."

III.

So important did the apostle see and believe this to be that he does not state the two things—our endurance under wrong, and our sight of God—in their historical order, but in their moral or eternal order. As a matter of experience men and societies are first conscious of wrongful suffering, and then they begin to ask, "How shall we meet it?" But St. Peter transposes this natural succession; he places first the sight of God whom by sense we see not; and secondly the wrongful

suffering which we sensibly feel or see. "Through conscience toward God," he says, "bear up under grief when you are suffering wrongfully." He had seen in Christ's empty grave that the world which had crucified its Saviour must be so out of joint that it could hardly be expected to do anything else than wrong to one with conscience toward God. One who cares to set it right, and bears the cross through this care, shares the Shepherd's soul, and has felt His "conscience toward God."

But what is this "conscience toward God"? It does not simply mean conscientiousness, or scrupulous tenderness of conscience. It means that conscience which the crucified and risen Son had toward the Father through always seeing Him as He is. It means our *consciousness* of God; the sight of the invisible and eternal Unity; the possession of pure light on the Will of wills and the relation of that Will to the world and to us. Whoever has this sight can have no doubt of His victory through man over wrong, even when wrong seems to have power over us, to have got us down, and to be defeating us. Christ, in His Passion, says St. Peter, "committed Himself to Him who is judging righteously." The secret of endurance, he says, is not to be found in a stoic or ascetic hardening of ourselves, but in looking at "the King immortal, invisible, the only wise God"—whom he and his fellow-apostle had seen visibly in Jesus Christ, the image of the invisible God, whom they always were seeing invisibly in the Spirit. The "conscience toward God" of which St. Peter speaks is the constant sight of the invisible God by our reason and conscience, such a sight of God by men, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, is faith. Nothing less deserves the name of the "assurance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The Hebrew Christian found in it the expla-

nation of all that had ever been done and suffered by men for the sake of God and mankind from the beginning of history. "I have set the Lord always before me : for He is on my right hand, therefore I shall not fall" (Psa. xvi. 9, 10). By this conscience of God the founder of their nation got power to redeem his enslaved brethren ; " for he *endured as seeing Him who is invisible.*"

THE CHURCH AND THE COMMONWEALTH AS NATIONAL EDUCATORS †

“What manner of child shall this be?”—ST. LUKE i. 66.

MUCH of the bitter warfare which now rages throughout Europe over the question of schooling might be avoided, or at least some of its bitterness might be modified, if the combatants of each party would agree to recognise the three simple facts which confront every observer. What are these so evident facts? (1) That the State sees that it is obliged to reach after its ideal as a “fatherland,” and become an educator of its children; (2) that the bishops and priests of the Church will not cede their claim that they are obliged by their commission to insist and prove that they are the God-sent educators of the nations; (3) education is one thing, and schooling is quite another.

I.

The State or National Commonwealth, somewhat late in its history, is now everywhere awakening to the recognition of the truth that it is bound, for its own sake, to insist that every child born within its jurisdiction shall have a competent schooling. The English people are asking, as they look at each new native whom the Lord, by the first birth, adds to the nation :

† Preached at Oxhey Church, Hertfordshire, on St. John Baptist's Day, 1883.

“What manner of child shall this be?” That it is a proper function of the State to be the great corporate schoolmaster is not a novel theory invented by political speculators, nor is it a plank in the platform of one of the parties dividing the State ; but it is a conclusion to which all practical statesmen have been forced by the misery of men and the difficulties of just government. As to the quality, as to the quantity, as to the exact end and purpose of the schooling to be demanded or provided by the Commonwealth, politicians differ. Some are afraid of over-schooling : a candidate at our Harrow School Board Election this year¹ urged us to choose him as our representative of desirable national culture, because he would maintain “the important principle that too much A, B, C often means an empty cupboard.” Others, who do not believe that the end of man’s nativity is the worship of Mammon, are more fearful of too little schooling. Some hold that the real object of public education is mainly individual, and that the Commonwealth ought to set up schools in order to help every boy and girl to “get on,” as they phrase it—which too often means, as we have to reiterate, a training in the anti-social art and mystery of getting a hundred less self-aggrandising fellows “off.” Others hold that the proper object of the schoolmastership of the State is far higher and deeper ; that it is social ; that it aims at the fulfilment of all that is implied in the noble old English name for the State—“the Commonwealth” ; that every common lad and lass ought to be educated and schooled by the common authority, for a common rather than a selfish or individual end. They believe that the object of a *national* education, of a *State* education, is not attained unless the schooling is instinct with the moral meaning of the quality

¹ Preached in 1883.

“national,” or makes the scholars more helpful and profitable members of that Nation or State into which the providence of the Father has by birth or naturalisation incorporated them. Indeed, whenever we hear men arguing about “national” education, or “public” schooling, we should insist that they do not forget this meaning of the social adjectives which they are using. Any schooling which develops a boy’s selfishness, or eagerness to be rich, or a girl’s caste prejudices, any schooling which does not mortify and restrain them, has no just title either to call itself “national” or to call itself “public.” The charters of our old English local schools, because they were founded under the communalising influence of the Church, lay great stress upon the profitableness of the scholar to the “Commonwealth” as the object of the school. It was a true historical and ecclesiastical instinct which guided the founders of our parish-schools, now vaguely and absurdly called “voluntary schools,” to name a parish-school a “national school.” The parish is an organ both of the State, or body-corporate of all the born, and of the Church, or body-corporate of all the re-born.

As Christians, or members of the universal-human fellowship wider than the nation, we are all bound to accept the highest view of the State. As a priest, or one of the educators sent by Jesus and His apostles to the nation, I am bound to teach no other. It is through the Church that a nation learns *all* that it is. Churchmen, laity and clergy, are pledged to desire and to endeavour that all national and parochial schooling—even in its most secular aspects, and apart from any directly theological or eternal elements in it—shall tend to inspire the scholars to serve the Commonwealth rather than to serve self; or, in Christian language, to worship the Father by serving the brethren,

rather than to serve Mammon, Caste, Party, or Sect, which are the Father's chief enemies and mankind's chief dividers. And every boy or girl is serving the Father, consciously or unconsciously, in proportion as his or her life is helpful to the common family in State or parish.

The bishops and clergy of the Church, we ought always to remember, are *ex-officio* "national" servants. The nationality of the clergy does not depend upon the establishment and endowment of more or fewer of them by the Commonwealth, but upon their apostolic mission. Hence we of the clergy ought not only to insist that the State's schooling shall be qualitatively "national," but we are also bound to rejoice at the modern demand that it shall be quantitatively "national"—that no native shall be left outside its beneficial range. The demand is a sign that God has answered the daily morning and evening petition of His Church in England, and has not taken His Holy Spirit from us. The very desire that all shall be educated—that the very worst and very best shall be educed out of every native for the sake of all the nation—must be a product of that Spirit who, as St. Peter said at the first festival of the Holy Spirit, on the birthday of the Catholic Church, is poured out upon all flesh. When a nation begins to recognise that it is an educator, and to insist that every child born in it shall receive a competent schooling, it has taken the first step, as I think, upon that saving path of social repentance and social amendment to which the Word of God in His prophets and in His Son in vain called the nation of the Jews. There ought to be for a national clergy a great consolation in the sight of the lofty schoolhouses which are now everywhere standing in the midst of the mean houses of the poor.

II.

The first simple fact which I have asked you to recognise is, then, this—that the State, or totality of citizens, as the representative of the nation, or totality of natives, sees itself obliged to be an educator, and that the modern State is everywhere awakening to the obligation, and is setting up schools as its instruments of national education. But the States are here confronted with that other fact which we Church folk cannot forget, and which no modern State can afford to ignore, namely, the assertion of Christendom that God has already provided humanity, nations, parishes, and consciences with an authoritative and universal educator. Here is a society whose apology for its presence in the nations and communes is that God has said to it, "Go, Teach." For nearly 1900 years the bishops and clergy of Christ's universal-human fellowship have been claiming a title from God to be the educators of nations and persons. Look at the Charter of the Church. Jesus Christ commissioned His apostles to teach and to ordain and send forth others to teach "all nations" and "every creature."

Has God appointed two rival educators? It cannot be any part of His will that the Church and the State, the universal-human society and the national society, should be enemies, for He is as really the Founder of the State, as the Old Testament shows us, as He is the Founder of the Church. Is, then, the State to educate boys and girls for this world, and the Church to educate them for some other world? That was not the doctrine of the Apostle of the States or Nations. You know how great a part of his own educational letters to various Churches is taken up with the enforcement of the duties of masters and servants, of husbands and

wives, of parents and children, of rulers and ruled, of neighbours, of friends and foes—relationships which belong to this world and are the cause of so much of the business of every State. The Church is obliged by her nature to seek concurrence with the State and the parish, as she has already sought to concur with the family, in the education of every boy and girl.

Yet it is exactly at this point that the great difficulty begins. A State may be willing, even may be anxious, to utilise the claims of the Church to be the teacher of all nations and every creature. But if a State asks, "What and where is the Church?" it sees a score of rival societies start up and claim the title, each for itself, of being the true Church of Christ. How is the State to discover which of all these claimants is properly the Church?

Although this is a difficulty which does not occur to you and me, or one which we think we have solved, we must not ignore that the modern State cannot be satisfied with our answer. To us the Church is an organic reality, founded not upon opinion, but upon the actual constitution of mankind into nations, communes, families, and persons—the whole of which the Son of God sums up in Himself, and represents as our Second Adam, the Head of every man. The business of the State is the maintaining of justice or righteousness. It is bound to show no favour to men on the ground that they are Churchmen or clergymen, but to deal equal justice to those who are without and those who are within the Church. Indeed, the State, by its very nature, does not know men as Christian men, but simply as natives and as citizens. Meanwhile the Church can never retreat from her position that she is an educator by her very being, and that "all nations" and "every creature" are indicated to her

by God as her proper scholars. A bishop abuses the gift of consecration, a priest or deacon abuses the gift of ordination, a layman abuses the gifts of baptism and confirmation, each ignores his share of the universal priesthood, unless he is taking care, in one way or another, to be always and everywhere a teacher. By our admission into the Church we are all pledged to do some part of the education of the family, the parish, the nation, and the race into which the Father has incorporated us. For the Church is His witness what each of these social organisms properly is. This educating obligation is *à fortiori* true of the clergy of the Church. If we were to renounce our claim of being the God-sent educators of "all nations" and of "every creature," we should violate the law of our existence, and gainsay the reason of our calling. It would be less unfaithful, less of an apostasy from Christ, for the Church to cease meeting publicly for the common worship of God than for her to cease in her activity as the obligatory educator of all nations and every creature. Hence, though the State becomes an educator, though it sets schools in every commune, though it insists that every native shall be taught in one or other of these State schools, though it should in time to come prohibit the Church from setting up any rival schools—the bishops and priests of the Catholic Church will still remain, and still be bound practically to assert that they are the rightful and divinely commissioned teachers of mankind, nations, families, and consciences. Every bishop and priest of the Church of Christ has a patent of teaching, a sacred order and apostolical licence to educate, which the State did not give, and which it can neither limit nor take away.

III.

This apparent competition between the Church and the Commonwealth as teachers leads me to remind you of the importance of a third fact which we all acknowledge, namely, that schooling is one thing, but education another thing. As the State is everywhere appropriating the schooling of the young as one of its functions, and rightly as I think; as the Church, and especially the episcopate and priesthood, can never retreat from the position Christ has indicated as obligatory towards all nations and every creature, and may hereafter have no schools (except schools for the clergy), the old distinction between schooling and education assumes a new political and ecclesiastical signification. Education is far older than schooling; it is the mother of schooling; it is practicable without schools: it may even attain to a very rich development without schools. I have talked with educated men who could neither read nor write. I have talked with men who have obtained an academical patent of some sort, but who nevertheless could not be said, in the full Christian sense of the term, to be possessed of much education. Schooling, however rich and full its contents may be, is never in itself education, though it may be made a noble instrument of it. The Eternal Wisdom founded a Church, and not a school. When Jesus sent forth an apostolic clergy to the nations, He joined something with teaching: He joined together teaching and baptizing; and it is from baptism that I learn what education rightly is. Education is a recognition, an awakening, and a cultivating in "every creature" of that childhood to God and brotherhood to every man which is the central truth of his being. Or to put a truth which we have learned from the Catholic theology

into terms which are not theological—Education is the bringing forth in each boy and girl of that common and equalising humanity which is the bond uniting man to man, nation to nation, class to class, generation to generation. It is certain that this education, helpful as schools are to it, can be conducted without schools.

The Church in the apostolic age, though she gave a common education to men of the most diverse nations and classes—Jews, Romans, Greeks, rich and poor, slaves and free men—possessed no schools. The clergy of England during the last half-century—in which the masses of the people, though they have not ceased to belong to the Church, have so largely ceased to take part in the public worship of their parishes—has possessed the schooling of the majority of them. The nation and clergy have day-schooled and Sunday-schooled the millions; but have they educated one in twenty of them? No priest can be said to have taught the alphabet of an ecclesiastical education unless he has taught the children that their confirmation binds them to *be* the Church, and not merely to *go* to the building called the church, and that to *be* the Church involves as much as to *be* the State or Commonwealth—that is, to exercise the duties and rights of a free man or elector in the society. It is not only the disastrous wave of Puritanism and its unchurching doctrine of “election” of the few in the seventeenth century, nor the disastrous wave of Methodism and its unchanging doctrine of “conversion” in the eighteenth century, by which the many have lost the sense and the use of their incorporation by baptism into the Kingdom of Christ. It is rather that the education given by the national clergy has not been so deep or so full, for very explicable reasons, as the education given by statesmen has been. Englishmen would be indignant nowadays if a patron

duke or banker were to appoint whom he pleased to serve as their minister in Parliament; but they still continue so wretchedly uneducated as to feel no indignation at the far greater scandal that a patron can appoint whom he pleases to serve them as their minister in the congregation of the Lord.

Fifty years hence, in every thoroughly civilised and progressive State, the clergy will possess no schools. The schools, in which the children of the rich and the poor will sit side by side, will have become exclusively a province of the State and the communes. Yet that will be no reason why the bishops and priests of the Educator of the world, fifty years hence, may not be much more effectual teachers of the nations and educators of consciences than they now are, or have ever yet been. The priest's lips should keep knowledge. His function in the national order is permanent; it is not, like that of the prophet, exceptional and accidental. The keeper of knowledge—of that knowledge which men *need* to know, but which the worse self in them wants not to know, as well as the knowledge which they want to know—must be the teacher of teachers, the teacher of father and mother, the teacher of schoolmasters, the teacher of citizens, the teacher of statesmen—though not their teacher in those disciplines which they understand far better than he does. The Church is properly the educator of educators. She has no more direct function to educate a boy than to educate an old man. Neither is it any more the Church's duty to keep a school for the workman's sons than for the duke's daughters. The rich who *go* regularly to Church have departed, at least as widely, from the social doctrine of Jesus Christ as the poor have, who have ceased to be Church-goers. The social doctrines of Jesus are so contrary to the precepts of Caste and

Mammon, that we ask God to-day in the collect to "make us," after St. John Baptist's example, "constantly to speak the truth, boldly rebuke vice, and patiently suffer for the truth's sake, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

If the national bishops and priests are true, bold, and patient in their educational calling, the Church will not lose but will gain, and will become more fully the educator of the nation, by having no schools which she can call exclusively her own, and into which she can get *some* of the children. For it is not in the charter which Christ has given us that we should insist on merely teaching *some*, as we should do if we set up schools in rivalry to the schools of the Commonwealth, and private and so-called voluntary schools over against the public schools. "Nations," according to Christ's charter, are the schools of His apostles; and "every creature," according to another reading of that charter, is the scholar of the Church. To claim a few, instead of claiming all, is to set up a new kind of Calvinism. It is as absurd and wrongful a nomenclature to put the name of "Church" schools upon clerical or clericalist schools, as it is to call our aristocratic and capitalist secondary schools, like Eton or Harrow, "public" schools. No school is a public school, unless, like that schooling of which the sacrament of baptism is the A B C, it is open freely to "the public," to man as man, not as the member of a birth- or a purse-caste. Nothing is of the Church unless it is for all. Nor is a school a "Church" school, a school of the universal-human society, unless it teaches what every clergyman is obliged to teach by Baptism—often in spite of his own social prejudices and superstition—that Jesus Christ, who is educating all men by His common Spirit, is no respecter of persons or classes. No school

can really be a "Church" school until the children of rich and poor are taught side by side in it the same social and humane doctrine as they are taught by the sacrament which brings them alike into the Church.

True it is that the clergy have been for many ages not only the educators of the nation, but have possessed and used schools as instruments of education. Hence it may seem hard that they should now be forced, by the processes of Christ's world-government, to give up their schools, and to fulfil by other methods their permanent office as the educators of the nations. But what the Lord is now doing will surely seem less hard to us if we will but recollect that it is a mere accident in the Church's history, that it is only by an exceptional act of His providence, that His Church became and continues partially to be a keeper of any schools save such as are for the particular education of the clergy. The Church, as Mr. Matthew Arnold has said, is a society for the promotion of all good. It is the society which not only holds forth the ideal of all other societies, but which supplements their defects. If in any time or place the Church sees some good work undone through the proper doers neglecting to do it, it is her business to set about doing it as well as she can, until the work is taken up by those whose proper function it is. This is why the clergy have taught not only the gospel, which they are permanently bound to teach, but have also taught mathematics, history, geography, reading, writing, summing, drawing, needlework, and all sorts of things which do belong to their province as the educators of the nations. On the same ground, in the Middle Ages, it was the Church which provided the nations of Europe with painters, architects, sculptors, musicians, philosophers, scientists, and all the ministries of culture and manners. On the same ground the Church became the

reliever of the poor, the registrar of such census as there was, and the parish priest often officiated as the secular head of the local commune.

But a time comes in the providence of Him to whom all authority is given in heaven and on earth, who is head over all things to His Church, when these non-ecclesiastical functions of the ministers of His Word and sacraments—and greatly by reason of the unperceived educating influence of His Church upon the nations—are claimed by those to whom they properly belong. So it has been with painting, architecture, music, science, poor-relief, registration, and secular office. So it must now be with schooling. All increase of the sense of obligation to the whole in State and Commune, all growth of conscientiousness in the society or the individual, ought to be recognised and joyfully welcomed by the Christian reason as a product of that one and the same manifold grace of God which called him out of darkness into light, and from self-seeking to duty to his neighbour.

THE COMMON SALVATION AND SCHEMES OF SALVATION¹

“Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little.”—St. JOHN vi. 7. (Holy Gospel for Trinity XXV.)

I N to-day's Gospel, which is also the Gospel for mid-Lent Sunday, the Lord reveals Himself as the economical Reformer, as the Saviour of the bodies of men, as that “King” whose manifestation in this world the prophet foretells in to-day's Epistle, “A King shall reign, and prosper, and execute judgment and justice in *the earth*. In His day Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is His name whereby He shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness.” It is an especially seasonable Gospel in this particular year. It is being read at every parish altar in the nation, at every centre where the local community is called to the “*Common Prayer*,” during a week in which a great-hearted and astute sect-founder, endowed with no mere two hundred pennies, but with thousands of pounds, and followed with the undiscerning laudations of the rich, the mighty, and the noble of the world, is engaging himself to do a miracle not unlike that which the Lord did. What He did amongst the hungry by the power of His Word and by the simple obedience of His twelve

¹ November 23, 1890.

chosen apostles, Mr. Booth promises to do by the power of money, and by the work of his male and female captains. A frightened world, or age, believes him, and is pouring out its money at his feet. For, as Jesus said to that age, in the discourse which precedes the miracle, "I am come in My Father's name and ye receive Me not. If another shall come in his own name, him will ye receive."

The contrasts between the Lord's salvation and Mr. Booth's "scheme" of social salvation, I need not say, are endless. The setting of some of these contrasts side by side is no act of our choosing; we see them forced upon us by the Gospel and by the unthinking madness and fashion of the world or age, which some days ago followed Mr. Barnum, yesterday followed Mr. Stanley, to-day follows Mr. Booth, and to-morrow will follow another, pouring out its plaudits and its money upon its temporary hero. Its heroes are in earnest, each in his degree: but the world is not. The world must have gigantic excitements, glaring advertisements, gorgeous promises, and ambitious schemes, or else it will not pause and attend. One day we run to Olympia to see the biggest show ever puffed together; another day we hope that a new continent is opened for our Babylonish competition and robbery; another day we are fascinated by a huge scheme for feeding and employing the victims whom our Babylonish competition and robbery have driven to starvation, forced idleness, prostitution, and vagabondage. As we asked, "Have you seen Stanley?" so we now ask, "Have you read Booth's book?" But now the excitement of fear and responsibility, the dread of a great social catastrophe, and the conviction of guilt, have laid hold upon us. We will gladly pay Mr. Booth to rescue us, and to do our felt duties of brotherhood and sisterhood by the proxies whom he has enlisted and

commands, and whom he exhibits, in his highly coloured picture, doing our duties as citizens and parishioners in the military uniform of his sect.

He has two objects in view, first, a great social reform, and next, as the means to it, an endowment of his own Salvation Army. The most competent observers seem to agree that it has failed most conspicuously in the East End as a spiritual agency, but he thinks that it may be made to succeed as a social agency.

1. The King who shall execute judgment and justice in the earth is not an autocrat.

2. This King asks for no money; He rather pours contempt upon it, as an agent of salvation; He uses that which He finds, which the providence of the Father and the diligence of men have placed in His hands.

3. He has no new scheme and no new agents. He does all that He does by the ministry of the apostles whom He has chosen, ordained, and sent. I cannot now attempt to speak at length even of these few contrasts, but I shall say a little upon two of them—autocracy, and the demand for money.

I.

“When Jesus then lifted up His eyes and saw a great company come unto Him, He saith unto Philip, Whence shall *we* buy bread that these may eat?” He said “We.”

He did not autocratically say, as if God and men could be separable in the work of saving love, “Whence shall *I* buy bread?”

Whence shall *we* buy bread? First, the Saviour implies that the hungry have by their very hunger a right to daily bread; He repeated the doctrine which He had already taught His apostles in the prayer which

He had given them. Next He implies that the obligation of care for the feeding of the hungry is binding upon the whole society of which He is the Head and we are the members. There is one body, and one spirit. The apostles are to ask, as an apostle afterwards did: "Who shall separate *us* from the love of Christ?"—not only from that love which He has for us, but from that love which He would show by us. The King who shall execute judgment and justice on the earth is not a beneficent emperor, pope, generalissimo, or autocrat, who holds a place, so to speak, outside and above the multitude. He first humbles Himself that they may know Him to be their King and Prophet; He hungers that He may feed the multitude; He makes Himself poor that He may make the multitude rich. "So He was their Saviour. In all their afflictions He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence served them" (Isa. xliii. 8, 9). Then He calls upon His apostles and disciples to be one with Him by taking up their cross and following Him.

The Church has learned, as she shows in the Creeds, how it is theologically true that Jesus, when He acts thus for the whole multitude, does not use the autocratic "I," but implies that we all are in Him, and so are con-naturally partners and co-agents with Him and He with us, in the work of saving men. He is not *a* Son of God, as the heathen heroes and demi-gods were thought to be. He is the Son. You and I, and all the sons and daughters of mankind, are included in Him; so that in every one of us there is a part of that childhood to God, that real kinship to the Eternal One, the whole of which sonship and kinship is summed up in Him and manifested in Him, and represented by Him. He is that true light who is enlightening every man who comes into the world. He would have us know that He is in

us ; therefore He says to us, " We." He is the " Christ in all men," and " the Saviour of all men." He would have us believe that He is the Christ in us, and that He saves any man whom we help to save. " Neither is there salvation in any other," said one who helped Him in this saving of the multitude, " for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we may be saved," and therefore He says to us, " We." This is why the Church sings in the *Quicumque Vult*, the Athanasian psalm, that the Son of God is " One ; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh : but by taking of *the Manhood*"—that is, the taking of you, and me, and every human being without exception—" into God ; One altogether : not by confusion of Substance : but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man : so God and Man is one Christ." Therefore He says to us, What shall " we " do for the saving of the multitude? When Jesus lifts up His eyes, and sees a company faint, hungry, driven by the robberies of Caste and Mammon into despair and vagabondage, He also sees and feels Himself in them. He is as really one with the multitude as He is one with the apostolate. If He teaches, feeds, and saves by the hands of His apostles, He also hungers for knowledge, bread and salvation in the souls of the people to whom He sends them. He would have us see Him in all the faint, hungry, oppressed, and despairing social outcasts. It is part of His education of His apostles and of His Church to make them understand their unity with all the hungry in Him, to have the " fellowship of His sufferings." We are not to think that He speaks in a mere figure, but we are to believe that He reveals the whole truth about humanity, when He says, " Inasmuch as ye did it unto ' these,' or did it not unto ' these,' ye did it, or did it not, unto Me." So He says to us " Whence

shall *we* buy bread that these"—our fellow-members of the one body—"shall eat?" And this He says to-day to us, as to His Apostle Philip, "to prove" us, to draw forth and educate His own seed of salvation within us.

So in the real Saviour of Society there is nothing of the autocrat. His salvation, as His apostle says, is "the Common Salvation." He worketh *in us* both to will and to do. He saves and reigns by our own free will. He governs men through the will which His spirit has first made free. Without liberty there can be no salvation. Jesus can save because He does *not* "utterly refuse to have any committee, or any interference whatever from the outside." He does not say, like a Cæsar-saviour, or a Napoleon-saviour, "Leave everything to me: I can and will do nothing if any partners are thrust upon me: all you have to do is to find me a prodigious quantity of money, and *I* will 'buy bread that these may eat.'" The true Saviour encourages us to question. He provoked His apostles again and again, as we see throughout the Gospels, to reason and ask Him questions.

II.

The next characteristic of the true Saviour's salvation is the rejection of money, nay, the deliberate scorn and expulsion of the purse and cheque-book, by which it is preceded. First, to "prove" or educate His apostles, He shows that He knows them. He asks the very question aloud which He knew the old Adam, the carnal and wicked nature in them, to be already silently and inwardly asking. How can we get means "sufficient," money enough, to abolish the gigantic want, hunger, and misery in this social wilderness? It has often been our question. What has crowded the world with these starvelings, tramps, drunkards, vagabonds, and harlots?

Is it not the sheer want of money? Dives is pious, respectable, well-fed, properly clothed, has a roof over his head, his sons feel no anxiety about their bread, his daughters are married. Take away his money and he would soon be also a hungry, houseless tramp, and his daughters sink to the level of their moneyless sisters. How plain it seems that it is not the reign of the Word and Spirit of Christ Jesus, but simply more money that is wanted in order to "execute judgment and justice in the earth." How plain it seems that if the rich would but give to some capable saviour "sufficient" money, then London "might be saved," and England might "dwell safely."

How truly the Lord had reached the thought of the natural man in the apostle is clear from the apostle's answer. "Philip answered Him, *Two hundred pennyworth* of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little." We have not money enough to save them. The apostle had forgotten that contrast between the two rival kings, the two rival kingdoms, and the two rival subjections, which the Saviour had shown them in His first sermon. He then told them that if they were to serve the Father, Him who is the daily Giver of daily bread to the whole human family, they must first cast off the service of Mammon. He warned them that they could not save the nations by bank-notes. By the Father's will, "as it is done in heaven," there is and cannot but be certainty and sufficiency of bread in the earth for every one who needs. So wherever and whenever the Son sets up His Kingdom in its fulness in the earth, there and then (as this miracle shows) there is immediate sufficiency of bread for all the hungry, and more than sufficiency. Where Mammon's kingdom is still in possession, and men and women are subjects to it, there can only be certainty, and sufficiency of daily

bread for the rich and the competent. All the rest must depend for their bread, in a nearer or more remote degree, upon the will of the landlord and the money-lord. The one has appropriated, or inherited the appropriation, of the land which is the only source of bread for all, and which God has given to all, "to the children of men." The landlord says to the hungry, whose commons he has enclosed by laws made by those who have more than sufficiency of bread, "Get off my land. I want it for a park, or for a hunting-ground, or for a number of new streets; I will not have it ploughed and sown. Go across the sea to some other land; go into the towns, and ask the money-lords for work." The money-lord can say, "I have no work to give you; my business is bad; I am overstocked. I must cut down your wages; if you cannot live upon them, there are hundreds outside who will gladly take your place." Contrast with this the last words of the prophet in the Epistle, so eucharistical and evangelical, "And they shall dwell in their own land." When and where that true King reigns and executes judgment and justice in the earth, then and there the poor are fed, and therefore He says, "Distribute it yourself. You must join the Army, and not pay its General to find proxies to do your fighting, and to receive the blows which ought to fall upon you." "With what glad hearts and clear consciences might noblemen go to rest," said Bishop Latimer to the thievish Tudor Court, "when they had bestowed the day in hearing Christ complain in His members, and in redressing their wrongs."

III.

The Author of "the common salvation," which the rich and the poor alike need, asks of us, and asks within us, "What shall 'we' give that the hungry and the

oppressed may be saved?" We give nothing, He tells us, although we subscribe thousands, until we give ourselves. We give ourselves only by giving up all our powers, and giving up reputation, honour, autocracy, self-confidence, lust for leadership and dictation to others, vanity and self-satisfaction in our own schemes. The first requisite of every saviour of the wretched is obedience. A man who says, like a Cæsar or a Pope, that the first requisite of his scheme of salvation is that he shall and must be the one absolute commander, who substitutes his own "I" for the Saviour's "We," can never so reign as to execute judgment and justice in the earth. The King who must reign, the true Saviour and Leader, "though He were a Son," says the apostolic writer to the Hebrews, "yet *learned He obedience* by the things which He suffered, and being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him; called of God a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek." I doubt, though you may not share the doubt, whether a man fully *obeys* Christ so long as he refuses to acknowledge Christ's apostles. So St. Paul taught: so St. John taught: and the Lord Himself said "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me." The pope of this new international sect, like the Pope of Rome, may hold that the Bishops of the English nation are no successors of Christ's apostles, and in that case he does right in ignoring their office. But if he so thinks of them he ought plainly to say so, and not ask them to give him money to endow his army.

The true Saviour is no "Separatist." Under His reign "Judah shall be saved," the nation and not some natives of it, "and Israel shall dwell safely." He by his birth confessed fellowship with the whole of humanity, all who are born. So by His circumcision He confessed fellow-

ship with the entirety of His own nation. He set up no new sect, and no new temple of His own invention. He owned and purged from the robbers the national and established House of His heavenly Father, and claimed it as the house of common prayer for all nations. As He used their loaves and would not turn the stones of the wilderness into bread: so, as He said to the High Priest, "I ever taught in the Synagogues and in the Temple." He set up no separatist "barracks." His Church was not one more addition to the world's sects, it was the extension of the Kingdom of His father David over every people, and made "Jerusalem a praise in the earth," and has caused her "to be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name"—the kingdom of Jesus, the Holy Church throughout all the world.

The "King" of whom the Epistle speaks has enlisted and enrolled His own Army of Salvation, and sent His apostles to "all nations" to call upon "every creature" to take up his or her place in its ranks. Mr. Booth's "Salvation Army" is a noble conception, but a limited one, and its majors and captains (and privates, if there are any) are enlisted and constituted after a wholly different plan. It is a separatist, not a common army. It is the latest English evolution of the Moravian-Methodist conception that the life of religion begins in an emotion towards God, and is marked by the instantaneous flight from the terror of hell to the assurance of heaven. It has this improvement upon the older evolutions of Methodism, that its commander at once sets all his converts upon work of some kind and does not allow them to be mere religionists, lost in cares about their own souls. But the army of Jesus has its origin in the universal relation of mankind to God. Most of us were unconscious babes when we were sworn

into His sacramental host and were engaged, as the Common Office for Baptism says, "manfully to fight under His banner against sin, the world, and the devil; and to continue Christ's faithful servant and soldier unto our life's end." We were not enlisted and enrolled in the Common Saviour's Army because we felt an exceptional emotion, or had an exceptional conviction concerning ourselves, at some hot and noisy meeting amidst the unwholesome glare of gas and blast of trumpets, and thereby became spiritual aristocrats, entitled to look on our fellow-men as a lower caste of outsiders, we being "in the Blood" and they outside. But we were enlisted as soldiers of the Son of Man because we were common babes, vulgar children, such as He said were the con-natural citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven, exactly like all our fellows who were not baptized, not enlisted, but who equally with us have within them the new and better manhood which is the seed and birth of God, the kinsman of Christ, and the inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.

THE HEAVEN FROM WHENCE WE EXPECT THE SAVIOUR OF OUR BODY ¹

“Who mind earthly things: For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body.”—PHIL. iii. 19, 20.

ON Sunday last we looked at some of the contrasts which are forced upon every thoughtful observer by the juxtaposition of Christ's acts of bodily salvation over against these costly paper-schemes of salvation which are advertised by the religious world. St. Paul's words in the text set before us the chief of these contrasts: Our minding of earthly things is opposed to our looking to that heavenly commonwealth in which the Saviour is, and is always ready to be revealed. The words occurred in the Eucharistic Epistle two Sundays ago, but they are fit for Advent Sunday, because they turn our thoughts to the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ to change our vile body, both individual and social, that it may be made like unto His glorious Body. This is Christ's “scheme,” says St. Paul (*metaschematisei*).

Those “who mind earthly things” are not merely persons outside Christendom, whom we may please pharisaically to label as “the worldly.” The apostle was writing to a Church. He tells the Christians of

¹ Advent Sunday, November 30, 1890.

Philippi plainly that those whose conduct made him weep as he wrote, and whom he so indignantly describes as those "whose god is their belly, whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things," were not such persons as the religious world calls worldly men and women, unconverted, or unbelievers, but that they were Christians who had already made the profession that "our citizenship is in heaven." The most humane of our English novelists has shown us how his own belly may be much more the god of a man who runs about from tea-meeting to tea-meeting than of the honest, vulgar inn-keeper and his guests.

I.

There is doubtless for our age and nation a somewhat unseasonable tone in St. Paul's words. The contrast between earthly things and heaven is out of fashion. It is so contrary to the loudest cries of the *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of the age or world that now is, that only the simple or the thoughtful are likely to make it. Everywhere we hear men saying, apostolic men as well as others, if indeed they were not the first to say it: "We must mind earthly things; our citizenship may or may not be in heaven; we have preached too much about a citizenship which is not knowable by the senses; the duty nearest to us is to procure for the great mass and majority of mankind a more happy and hopeful citizenship here upon earth." This was first said by Maurice, who was persecuted and cast out for saying it. Many who now so glibly repeat it, and would pervert it to the building up of their own Babylons, are the children of those who persecuted and cast out the prophets.

The "time-spirit" is nowhere more clearly discernible in any age than in the formation of new sects. They are its own products, and peculiarly exhibit what is best

and what is worst in an age. The Church is the social organ and expression of the mind of the eternal and universal Spirit "unto whom," says our apostle, is "glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end." Therefore in each age the Church is witnessing to much which that particular age thinks untimely, or proper enough for the past, or possibly proper enough for the future. If the Church be Catholic in time, as well as in place, it cannot be otherwise. A sect, on the contrary, is one of the organs and expressions of the transient and limited views of that age in which it separates its adherents from the universal-humane christened fellowship in the parish, the nation, and the human-kind—the Catholic Church. An exact historical physiology of the sects would demonstrate the particular contribution of the age-spirit, the secular spirit, to every sect. An age imparts to its sects a character which they would not have had if they had separated from the Church in any earlier or latter age. Thus it would have been impossible for Presbyterianism, or Independency or Anabaptism, to have arisen out of our age, or come to any vigorous growth in it, because the thoughts and cares of the time are not now directed, as they were in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, towards the realisation of a perfect visible Church on earth, which shall contain no one who is not a "saint." A new sect, if it is to thrive, must catch and embody a quantity of the floating convictions, opinions, and usages of its age, both good and bad. Its inclusion of these gives strength to it while the age lasts, but they become a source of weakness and decay within it when a new age or world, with other thoughts and other wants, confronts the sect, and then men fall off from it to a newer sect, or to unbelief, or return to "the mother of us all."

There is no need to illustrate this truth by the history of the sects which have already perished, or of those which are now kept in a show of life by scarcely anything but organisation, party-zeal, attractive preachers, heredity, and money. We see it in that sect which is at present the temporary idol of the religious and monetary worlds, and is being so strangely bedaubed with undiscerning praise by newspaper-men, by self-called "practical" politicians and economists, by honest-hearted lovers of their kind, and by the popularity hunters who always follow a multitude to do evil, and therefore fail of the insight or the bravery to criticise anything which the noisy clamour of the moment is pleased to glorify. The so-called "Salvation Army" which Mr. Booth has enlisted, considered in itself and apart from the direction along which he now promises to march it, is simply (as I have already said) the latest English evolution of the Moravian-Methodist-revivalist conception of religion as an emotion towards God, and an instantaneous flight from the terror of hell to the certain assurance of heaven. "Every transient *gleam* of piety," said a wise and holy critic,¹ "is concluded to be that *flame* in which the Holy Ghost descended, and though it wants the main circumstance of resting on them, yet serves to personate the Comforter."

It seems, upon the surface, to be the least of all religious theories to "mind earthly things," even though ever so innocent a use be made of the quality "earthly." Nor had its astute founder, until a recent period in its

¹ "Decay of Christian Piety," by the author of "The Whole Duty of Man," 1665 (1672 ed. p. 153). Substitute the "Count" (Zinzendorf) for the "General," and the descriptions of Moravianism by the Rev. Thomas Green, 1755, may be read, allowing for the difference of the two ages, as an exact description of the "Salvation Army."

history, any intention to divert the attention of his captains from heaven to earth. But he has been forced, by the character and demands of the age, to see that he can only justify the continued separation of his captains from Christ's whole Army of the baptized in the parishes, in the fatherland, and in foreign nations, by putting them upon secular service. He has been forced to see that he can only ask the rich richly to endow his sect—or rather himself—by devoting its supreme attention to earthly things, by dressing it in a garment of socialism, by finding some wholesome and thriving social work for his officers to do. An "army" of expensive officers cannot go on for a whole age beating drums, blowing trumpets, enlisting recruits, and causing its voice to be heard in the streets. So deeply has the necessity of immediate social reform, and the fearful looking for judgment in the shape of a social catastrophe, seized upon the mind of our age, that a sect is now bound to be socialistic, or to be a failure.

II.

The autocratic English head of this new internationalist sect is not only appealing, as I was saying last Sunday, to the age's faith in money as the worker of miracles: he is appealing to the age's perception of the need of a social revolution, to the age's terror of the approach of a social catastrophe, and to the age's superstitious credulity in wholesale self-advertisers and project-advertisers. The age, or world that now is, cannot believe that the Saviour who shall bring forth judgment on the nations, must be One who shall "not cry, nor lift up, nor cause His voice to be heard in the streets." Whatever is not big and loud, pretentious, prodigal of promises, and tintured with some quackery,

it calls "theoretical" and "unpractical." It cannot understand how "the Kingdom of Heaven is like to a grain of mustard-seed, which indeed is the least of all seeds"; how the full power of it can only be given to a "little flock"; nor how the Church, the social organ of the Kingdom, can begin in a small upper room. It fancies the Kingdom of Heaven grows like the most prodigious fungus, that its power can only be given to a huge and clamorous multitude, and that a true Church must hire nothing less than a hippodrome. Hence Mr. Booth is asking those who have money to endow his army, or rather himself, with colossal sums of gold and silver, in order that he may experiment upon a costly and elaborate scheme for the extirpation, or rather the modification, of some of the evils of pauperism, or Mammon's long tyranny over Christ's poor. He does not propose to attack the tyrant. If he did, he would get a prophet's, rather than a sect-leader's reward, and would get few bank-notes. So mad is the age or world, that he is sure to get the gold. Princes, bishops, archdeacons, noblemen, merchants, theatre-managers, and popular preachers, hasten to pour gold and silver at his feet. Believe me, it is no pleasure to a quiet man to raise his insignificant voice in discordance with their thunders of applause. I have not felt free to waste time upon the study of his scheme, which I am told is a conglomerate plagiarism, like the degraded paste-and-scissors periodical "literature" of our age, from plans which others are working, or schemes which others have originated. Many years spent in the study of history have destroyed my belief in all self-called "practical" men, and in all schemes, except that scheme of God for all the ages, in which we already live, and move, and have our being. Hence, I have no inclination to make a detailed examination of the latest scheme.

The one important thought for every Christian about this scheme, as I said last week, is that its demand is for "earthly things," of which money is the type and chief. Its schemer cries "Money, money, money!" Money which is offered, or comes to us without the foregoing demand of a material or spiritual highwayman, is an oblation and a sacrifice; and until money is out of use will have its place in apostolic work. But in the social disease the pursuit of money has been the original seed of evil. I cannot think God will allow Mr. Booth, or any one else, to cast out Beelzebub by the invocation of Beelzebub, or Mammon by the help of Mammon. These devils of despair, pauperism, oppression, vagabondage, and harlotry, which he promises to cast out of England if the rich will provide him with colossal riches, are the necessary products of that very Mammon which he is invoking, to which he is praying, and without whose help he says he can do no such miracles. It is not apostolic to be going all over England pursuing riches, in order therewith to try and undo those very evils which the pursuit of riches alone has done. "This kind goeth not out" by riches. By the pursuit of riches it enters in and dwells in our social body. How come the streets and lanes of our city to be crowded with the "submerged tenth" of paupers, harlots, and vagabonds? Because Mammon as Landlord has robbed them of their own common lands to create estates for himself, driven them despairingly into the towns to compete against one another for the smallest wage which Mammon as Capitalist will grant them. Has not the Lord raised up prophets age after age to declare this truth to the rich? The sermons of our bishops and priests, from the Reformation until the baleful victory of Puritanism over Church and Commonwealth, and its suppression of moral preaching in England, are full of that witness.

We could cite Bishops Latimer, Scory, and Pilkington, Doctors Some, Lever, Bernard, Gilpin, John Moore, Henry Hammond and a hundred others. "There are certain beggars," said an English priest (Dr. Robert Some) in Elizabeth's reign, "who of purpose keep their legs sore to get money by it. If they are justly disliked who gain by their own sore legs, what deserve they to be thought of *who gain by other men's sore legs?*"

The undoubted good which Mr. Booth's captains have here and there done, amidst the unconsidered evil which they have done, and are doing, and are likely to do, needs no emphasis. It is not wholesome for any of us to be reminded incessantly of our own good works. That they have never "reached," as the phrase is, the intelligent among the poor, and cannot do so with their doctrine, is evident on all sides. Whatever good they have done seems to be due to the fact that they have *not* had the riches which their "general" now asks for them, but have been poor, and belonged to the poor. It was the teaching of the Abbot Joachim and the Minorite reformers that pauperism, with the social evils it begets, is a giant far too powerful for so feeble a dwarf as wealth to cope with. Poverty alone, as the Saviour and His apostles proved and taught, has power and nerve enough to cope successfully with such a monster. "Your fight in the future," a venerable American prelate is reported to have said to his clergy, "will be with the front pew," that is, against the very faith in money which has brought the Church and its clergy into bondage, the poor into vagabondage, and the existing divine "Scheme" of humane society into anarchy.

You may set up a patent social factory for converting the raw material of pauperism, vagabondage, and harlotry into competent, orderly, and moral men and

women ; but while you are busy on this, the Mammon which has found the money for your factory does not and will not cease to be as busy as ever in his own factories, heaping up a hundred-fold denser mass of new paupers, new vagabonds, and new harlots.

III.

The age, time, or world around us will not cease telling us that we can do no great good without much riches. "Fall down and worship me," says that world-spirit, "and I will give you all the kingdoms of the world" to save them. That in us which belongs to the world, and is of the world, and is not of the Father, but minds earthly things, listens with willing credulity. It is only the new man within us which has ear to hear and the heart to believe the hard counsel and word of command which Jesus gives to those whom He sends forth upon His battle for the redemption of their fellows. "And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto His disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God!" This explains the charge which He gave to the Twelve whom He entrusted with the keys of the Kingdom, and which He gave again, in almost the same words, to the Seventy: "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses." "Preach, saying, the *Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*; heal the sick, cleanse the leper, raise the dead, cast out devils."

We see in the Acts of the Apostles how the first soldiers of Christ understood and obeyed His command. "Silver and gold have I none," said St. Peter to the sick beggar, "but such as I have give I thee." What did the apostle give him? The Lord had not only told the rich young man who wished to follow Him that he must

first sell all that he had, and himself distribute to the poor, and not by proxy, as an old man might do: but He added that he should then have "treasure in heaven." So He had said to the apostles, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven," where eternal health and wholeness are, where there is no wasting rust or destroying moth.

St. Peter's treasure was in heaven, in that kingdom which the apostles were to proclaim "at hand." St. Peter's "citizenship," his "commonwealth," was where St. Paul in the text says his also was, "in heaven." That is, it was where Jesus Christ is, "whom," as St. Peter said, in his sermon after the lame man's healing, "the heavens must receive until the time of the restitution of all things (and not simply of one lame beggar) which God hath spoken by all His holy prophets since the world began." The heaven which St. Paul contrasts with "earthly things," and "from whence we (whether apostles or lame men) look for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body," is not future in time, nor a long way off in space. Heaven lies all about us, independent of time and space, and is where the name and saving power of Jesus are, separate from us only by a "veil."

St. Paul says emphatically that our citizenship or commonwealth "is," not that it can be, may be, or hereafter will be, "in heaven." That "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand" was the first sentence of the Gospel which the Lord commanded His apostles to preach, the first article of the Christian tradition. The heaven where the apostles' treasure and citizenship lay, and where the lame beggar's power of walking proved also to lie, was as near to the miserable man as were the earthly things, his lameness and misery.

St. Peter's "gift" was the Lord's sign or miracle,

showing how near our citizenship in heaven, and its health, are to us men. "In the Name of Jesus Christ," said St. Peter, "rise up and walk. And he took him by the right hand, and lifted him up, and immediately," heaven being so close at hand, "the feet and ankle-bones received strength." Whence came that strength? Out of the heaven at hand, near to us, whence we look for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, "who shall change our vile body" (individual and social), "that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body." The miracle which all the riches in the world cannot do, the poorest man in the world, by the aid of science, or the fuller revelation of God's laws in nature, may some day approach to doing.

It may be said, the apostles did not refuse silver and gold. No, indeed. But they did not ask for it from all sorts and conditions of men, caring not how it had been gained. Neither did they promise, like the advertisements of "the Salvation Army Building Association" in Mr. Booth's *War Cry*, to give a good percentage to those who endowed them with capital, engaging that their investments should not only yield their earthly things "four per cent.," but also be used for extending the Kingdom of—"Mammon"? No, the *War Cry* amazingly says, "of Christ." When money was freely offered to the apostles, they took it; and then, not "minding earthly things," those bold Christian politicians used it for the immediate establishment of a heavenly commonwealth upon the earth.

IV.

That apostolic socialism, that heavenly Jerusalem, built up by Christ's apostles in the very streets and houses of the Herodian and Pharisaic Jerusalem, you

may say, soon fell. Yes, just as its King fell and was crucified, died, and was buried—to rise again from the dead. That commonwealth has not perished; it returned to heaven, whence it came; as St. Paul says, it *is* in heaven, where mankind's King and Saviour is. And, having once been manifested in the earth, as the King was, it remains a possession for all ages, and will never be forgotten so long as the world stands. But it is not a mere memory; there it is, as Christ is, expected by all sufferers and all soldiers of righteousness to appear again in "power and great glory" at the restitution of all things.

Such was the use which the apostles made of the money that was freely laid at their feet. Who can imagine St. Peter saying, "Silver and gold have I none; but I will go to Pilate, Herod, Caiaphas, the Pharisees, and Sadducees, and beg or frighten them into giving me a mountain of silver and gold, so that I may try to heal every lame and wretched beggar in Jerusalem, and divert from the city its coming judgment"? The apostles took what was freely offered, the willing oblations forced upon them by those who had sold their possessions and lands. They distributed it to the whole Christian democracy; they kept no autocratic hand over it. They called upon all the Christian people to elect the distributors of it, so that it might serve all as the common-wealth; and they ordained those whom the voice of the Holy Ghost, diffused through the whole Church, elected as its ministers.

The apostolic refusal to be autocratic spenders of the common wealth of the Church became one of the great starting-points in the history of Christendom. Out of it the Holy Spirit evolved and instituted for all ages and all nations the sacred order of deacons. They now serve as the Levites of the "High Priest after the order

of Melchizedek," who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

It is the express function of the deacons, as every bishop in Christendom says to a deacon when ordaining him, "To search for the sick, and poor, and impotent people of the parish, to intimate their names, estates, and places where they dwell unto the curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the parishioners or others." It would not cost the expenditure of one single penny for every deacon in Christendom to begin so to fulfil his office. The earlier Puritan sectaries had no craving for so wide a sphere as a parish. They thought the parish too wide, as containing the reprobate majority of parishioners as well as the elect minority of "saints." Hence, they "gathered churches," as they called it, out of the parish, and had no desire that their churches should be big. But the newer sectaries of the Moravian-Methodist evolution complain that the parish is too small. "The world is my parish," say they, with all the ambition of a Wesley, but without his respect for the Church. "My preaching powers, my organising gifts," says one after another of these men, "are so great, that I cannot be content with a narrow sphere; I want a big chapel, a big hall, big audiences." If you say, the deacons have failed to do their work, what pledge have you that they would have succeeded if they had been called "majors" or "captains"? Besides, our deacons are not elected by the voice of the common Spirit in the whole local Christian commonwealth, as the apostolic deacons were. The ordination of our deacons is apostolic; but their call usually comes from merely one individual member of the Church. How can we expect them rightly and fully to execute their office, or even to understand it, until the Church has her part restored to her in their call?

JESUS OVERCOMING THE TEMPTATION TO POPULARITY †

THE "WESLEY CENTENARY"

"And Jesus went up into a mountain, and there He sat with His disciples. . . .

"When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him a king, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone."—ST. JOHN vi. 3 and 15. (Holy Gospel for Lent IV.)

IF this mountain were mentioned only here, in St. John's preface to the sign of the feeding, we should hardly see its importance at this crisis in the life of Jesus. St. John does not call it indefinitely "*a* mountain," as our version does, but he twice calls it "*the* mountain." It was some point in the heights above the lake which Jesus first consecrated, and afterwards used as a consecrated place.

I.

First, before the miracle of the feeding was wrought, "Jesus went up into the mountain, and there He sat with His disciples." He had chosen it as a place of escape from the crush of the people and from the dreadful temptation of popularity, as a seat of rest and of quiet education of the future fathers of the

† March 15, 1891.

Church, amidst whom He sat as Bishop in His pastoral chair. It was the mother of the cathedrals, or mother churches, of Christendom. When Jesus went up into the mountain, He began in person an act of which the building of our St. Paul's on the highest part of the City of London, was a continuation by His Spirit. It was from His cathedral throne, as the Bishop and pastor of all souls and bodies, that He looked down upon the thronging multitude, and taught His apostles to make the questions of the bodily needs of the people a first thought of their minds, as the fathers in God of the hungry and of them that are out of the way. It was from this mountain, and from the sacred synod He had held there, that He descended to feed the crowd.

Secondly, after the miracle of the feeding, "He departed again," says St. John, "into the mountain." I do not know how the 15th verse, which records this second ascent of the Lord into the sacred height, came to be omitted from the Eucharistic mid-Lent Gospel of the English Church. As St. John rounds off the episode of the feeding with such harmonious completeness, by showing that this work of the Saviour ended, so to speak, where it had begun, I was led to examine the mid-Lent Gospel in other National Churches of Western Europe, to see if they also omitted it, and I found that they include, as a part of the *Lætare* Gospel, the verse which relates the second retreat of Jesus into this same hill of the Lord.

For the second verse in our text is as certainly the epilogue of this history, as the first verse in our text is the prologue of it. When the satisfied crowds enthusiastically cried out, "This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world," Jesus found Himself submerged in even a more terrible popularity than that from which He had so lately fled. He saw

that the hungry and needy, of whom the kingdoms and republics of this world take so little count, had already in their hearts and imaginations elected Him as their king, and that they were meaning to establish an autocracy for Him by force. It was then, at this crisis in His life, "when Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take Him by force to make Him a king," that "He departed again into the mountain."

St. John emphatically marks the difference between His first and His second retreat. Although the sign of the feeding was indeed concluded where it had been planned, yet there was a distinction between its beginning and its ending which must have powerfully impressed St. John and his fellow-apostles. It began in His sacred synod. He had made them His comrades in the discussion of it, His fellow-workers in the doing of it. But after it was done, and had produced so startling a social-political result, Jesus not only separated Himself from the multitude, as He did before the miracle, but He separated Himself even from His own chosen twelve, "He departed again into the mountain," as one of them tells us, "by Himself alone." The very word which the Evangelist chooses to describe the Lord's second and solitary ascent, after the miracle and the popular applause, differs from that by which he described His first and social ascent with the apostles before the miracle. Then He simply "went up," the bodily action only is noted ; but now there is a note of the moral and intellectual action ; Jesus seceded : He "escaped," as St. Augustine has it : He isolated Himself.

The mountain was not only a cathedral in which the Bishop and Pastor of our souls had set His chair, and taught His disciples : it was His oratory or closet into

which, practising what He had taught in His sermon on the Mount, He prayed to the Father who is in secret. When He heard the signs of popularity ringing in His ears, when public opinion was declaring Him to be its prophet, when He saw the swift advance of a yet more dangerous popularity, He entered into His closet, and shut the door. Separating Himself from men, even from His own elect, the Son "withdrew" into the unity which He had with the Father and the Holy Ghost before all worlds, and so could say, "Yet I am not alone, for the Father is with Me." In this Holy Communion with the Father, and subjection of Himself to His will in all things, the Only-Begotten in our flesh gathered strength to contend by Himself alone against the re-appearance of the temptation which He had overcome alone in the wilderness, at the beginning of His work.

II.

What was that temptation? It was the temptation of every good man of power and greatness more than ordinary. I speak of it to-day because it seems to me to have been the temptation of John Wesley, who certainly was a good man of more than ordinary power and greatness. Therefore the temptation had to be met by the Man who is alone in all things great, so that He might fulfil all leadership, and be the example to the great and forceful as well as to the small and feeble of our kind. He was in all points tempted as such men are.

It was the temptation of popularity, the temptation to autocracy, the temptation to set up a kingdom for one's self, the temptation not to discourage the institution of a party or sect of which one's self shall be the head, instead of bearing witness through

the Cross to the eternal Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of the Father, which was already set up throughout nature and humanity, and was to be discerned, as He had told His disciples, within them. The Kingdom could only become the Kingdom of Jesus Christ through His renunciation of Himself, and obedience unto death, even the death of the Cross: that is, He must prepare for His rejection by those who have now so enthusiastically elected Him.

It seems to me that our Lord was tempted by Satan through the multitude to found what men call "Christianity," a new system and sect of faith and morals, over against the eternal and actual Kingdom of God, as Mohammed founded Islam, and George Fox founded Quakerism, and Wesley founded Methodism. Is it not the common illusion of the sceptic and the antisceptic that Jesus Christ, while He was on earth, actually did set up an outward sect in His own name, a "Christianity," instead of founding a Catholic Church after He had ascended to the right hand of the Father? Has not every Catholic Christian reason to be grateful to those critics who think they are destructive, but who really bear unconscious witness to the Faith, when they tell us that St. Paul, and not Jesus, was the founder of "Christianity"? In the solitude of the consecrated mountain, the Lord contended against and defeated the temptations of the social Satan, in the form of the spirit of public opinion and popular applauses and demands, exactly as He had already in the solitude of the wilderness resisted and overcome the temptation of the private Satan, in the form of the friendly and prudent individual spirit concerning itself for His success in life as an exceptionally brilliant servant of God and benefactor of mankind. So Jesus "escaped," to repeat the strong expression of St.

Augustine, into this consecrated spot, going "alone" behind the veil, as our great High Priest, there to appear in the presence of God for His Nation and for us.

The Jews had no need, as we have no need, of that which men call "Christianity," such as the multitude wanted Jesus to set up. A Christian sect, whatever name might have been put upon it, would really have been something lower than that which men call "Judaism" or "Mosaism." For what they call Judaism was not a mere Sect, nor a mere religion, nor a mere system of opinions and morals: it was a real *people*, commonwealth, nation, church, a kingdom. It was a Kingdom of God, called naturally into being, as the universe was, by the living Word of the Lord in the process of world-history. A Judaism, or a Mosaism, or a Christianity (in the popular modern senses of that word), would have been nothing but a Sect, having only so much relation to the real or natural order—the Kingdom of God, revealed through the forms of nation, parish, and family—as Quakerism has, or as Wesleyanism has. The Word of God had subjected the circumcised nation to the Roman Cæsar, and this subjection galled the people, as it was meant to do. The enthusiastic masses, under the wild ecstasy of an instantaneous conversion, urged Jesus to become their Saviour by allowing them to set Him up as their King. But their and His own subjection to Cæsar was not viewed by Him as it was by them. He saw in it the Father's judgment upon the elect nation for their rebellion against the Kingdom of God within them. For He told them that the Kingdom of God, which the Father sent the Son into our universal flesh to manifest, is not only outward over nature and nations, and always revealing its laws in history, as

their prophets had taught; but He told them that it is at the same time that Kingdom which is inward to every man upon earth, whose laws the universal conscience recognises in its accusings and excusings, even though it cannot (until it hears the Gospel of His Son) satisfactorily account for them. "Yea Thy law," said their Psalmist to God their King, "is within my heart."

The Son did not bring the Kingdom of God into the world by His birth into our nature. Nor did He at any period of His life on earth set it up, or pretend to set it up, as His apostles hoped He would do, and as the multitude after the great feeding determined He should do. But He proclaimed it to be "at hand," to have been always in the world, and to be there and then within men. The Kingdom of Christ, the Catholic Church, was not a Sect which Jesus Christ of His own will, or in compliance with the requests of His disciples or the crowd, Himself set up. The Father *gave* the Kingdom to the Son. It was natural for Satan—in the form of a wise religious adviser, or in the form of the popular demands for a more humane ordering of the world—to suggest to Jesus that it would be better for Israel and the whole world to be under His autocracy than under Cæsar's. Who can doubt it? Nevertheless He would not allow a crowd to make Him a King, which would have been the seizing of a Kingdom for Himself. Hence it was not during the humiliation in the earthly Jerusalem, but out of His glory at the right hand of the Father in "the Jerusalem above which is the mother of us all" (as to-day's Epistle has it) that Jesus founded the Catholic Church, the human universal fellowship for all nations and every creature. Jesus, while He was upon earth, spoke of His own Kingdom as future. "On

this rock"—the union of God and all Humanity in Him—"I will build My Church."

Whether we are inside or outside the Church, we are always in and under the Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom is always within us. But we become members of the Church by humbly taking His sign of humiliation upon our proud foreheads, and so obeying the most easy, rudimentary, and outward of His commands by His apostolical legates to all nations and to every creature. Our ambition for an individual distinction, or our natural tendency to conceive of God after our likeness, may prompt the old Adam in us to despise baptism as a thing outward and unspiritual, or as a thing common and levelling, which any vulgar body may have. We fancy that our incorporation into the Church ought to be the reward of some private merit of which we can boast; such is not catholic, but is wanting in common men, women, and children. We forget that Christ's Kingdom, the Church, is the elect witness to the Kingdom of God out of which it issued, and in which it dwells alongside with the States, the communes, the families, and all else that has issued out of the Father's Kingdom. We think of the Church as a sect or aristocracy founded by Christ, in which such as are more or less like Christ, or liked by Him, can buy membership by their own individual conversion, their own spiritual perception, their own faith, their own particular grace or favour in His eyes, whereby they are differenced from the catholic race of mankind, and so elevated and distinguished above and from the rest of the family, the mass of the commune, the generality of the nation.

III.

I think that the recollection of the common and self-renouncing ground upon which the Church stands is not

out of place at this time when all the sects which have grown out of the remarkable experience and work of John Wesley have been busy, as some of you will know, at the celebration of a "Wesley Centenary." The co-existence of a churchly tendency and a sectarian tendency in the character and work of Wesley seems to me to be so evident as to justify alike the Church and the Wesleyan sects in claiming him. The proofs that he intended no schism, but desired his societies to remain in communion with the Church of the parishes and the nation are surely irrefragable. Nevertheless, the proofs that the movement which he started, and the ways along which he so autocratically directed it, could not but end consistently in separation of his societies from the Church, though contrary to his personal wishes, seem to me to be equally clear. If the late Roman Cardinal Newman had died on the eve of his submission to the Pope, much such a controversy, with truth on both sides, would have arisen concerning him. The evil is, as the Holy Gospel teaches us, that any one individual Christian should be exalted to such a prominence as to be made by force a king, as Wesley was and is, or as Newman was and is. John Hampson, who knew Wesley well, said of him in the year of his death, "Mr. Wesley was, during the last ten or fifteen years of his supremacy, the most absolute of *monarchs*. His will was the law." And again, "Like other *sovereigns*, Mr. Wesley was surrounded by flatterers, and like them, too, he often mistook the incense of adulation for the cordial offering of sincerity and truth." One of Wesley's recent apologists has compared his hero, with unintended irony, to the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte. Against that temptation which the Lord rejected, and which the selfish Bonaparte greedily accepted, the unselfish Wesley offered little or feeble resistance. Whether he desired it or not,

he allowed himself to be made an autocrat in the house of the Lord, so that it depended upon his decree whether his subject societies should or should not separate themselves from the unity of the Church.

The departure of our King into the mountain by Himself alone has always been recognised by the conscience of the Church as His deliberate renunciation of holy ambition. That profound mediæval biographer of the Lord, Ludolf of Saxony, fitly interposes in his commentary upon this episode a long chapter on "the ambition of the clergy and the religious." It would not be hard to maintain the thesis that the ambition of the good and religious, their too ready consent to be made kings by force for the best of purposes, has done at least as much hurt throughout all Christianity as the ambition of the selfish and wicked. John Wesley's autocratic reign has left a terrible inheritance of evils from which the Church and the nations suffer, and are likely long to suffer. I need only mention the grounding of religion upon "Egoism stretched out into the Infinite," which Carlyle saw to be the root of Methodism; the constantly recurring epidemic and plague of "revivals," which have lost whatever naturalness they once had, and are now glaringly artificial projects to help a "cause," rather than to help souls; the diseased ambition of preachers to have great crowds hanging upon their words; the worship of a Barnum-like bigness, and the measurement of the work of the Holy Ghost by size and number; the increase of that decay of general Church-going and Communicating which began under the twenty years of the cruel Puritan tyranny, when the Sacraments were first restricted as privileges of the self-called "godly," and withheld from the dear, common, vulgar people of every English parish. Wesley meant to be an evangelist, and to a very splendid degree he became what he meant to be. But

the Church is a part of the Evangel, its necessary social complement in the commune and the nation ; and where a sect is substituted for the historical and actual Church, the gospel is maimed. There is nothing schismatic or anti-social in an *ecclesiola in Ecclesia*, such as Wesley aimed at, such as the German Pietists had conceived, such as each monastic order was, and as every Guild in the Church is. A certain separation is involved in each. It only becomes schismatic and anti-social when its members separate themselves for selfish, religious reasons from that parochial and national fellowship into which the Father has incorporated them by birth and providence, and which the Son has vindicated by becoming a fellow within them, and which the Holy Ghost has sanctified by the common baptism and the common eucharist, by a common ministry and a common prayer.

I cannot but think that some historian who discerns the Word of God in English as well as in Jewish history, will hereafter have insight, faith, and patriotism to see and declare what great evils, as well as what good amongst us, have been products of Wesley's consent to be made a king. Does not the survival and present use of the word "Wesleyan" show how he spiritually damaged and broke in pieces the parochial houses of God in the land, as the Puritan Nonconformists and Dissenters had materially damaged them, though he originally was of a contrary mind to the Puritans, and meant to build up what they had broken down? They believed that the Church of England was no Church at all, and that it was a sin to belong to her ; but thanks to his noble family, John Wesley had no share in the Puritan legends and superstitions. Yet who is more to blame than this pious autocrat is for the disastrous "alienation of the masses," the absence of the Common

Folk from the Common Prayer of the neighbourhoods of which the Common Father has made them members? The Community or Socialism of English Religion, witnessed to in the English Book of *Common Prayer*, was indirectly struck at by Methodism, as it had been directly attacked by Puritanism, and an Individualist saving or sanctifying of the self-seeking soul was by each thrust into the place of the wholesome old communal and national salvation. "What profit or interest have I," asked and asks the selfish soul, "in joining in this Common worship with all my unregenerate neighbours, if I myself have no saving faith, if I am as unsanctified as my fellow-parishioners are?" "If I am elect, converted, saved, sanctified," said and says another, "is it not a waste of my spiritual gifts, which exalt me above the unsaved, to spend so much of my time in kneeling at their side as if I really were of one body with them, or in listening to a preacher who is so much less fit to teach than I am?" John Wesley struck indeed at the pharisaical spirit of sectarianism by requiring his preachers and societies to receive the Holy and Common Eucharist at the hands of the Common priests. Yet it was rather at his own kingly order, than at the command of the Holy Social Spirit of unity, that the Methodists received the Common Body and Blood of the One Lord side by side with their "unconverted" or "unsanctified" fellow-parishioners. Wesley's own individual experience and the dogmas of conversion and sanctification which he drew out of himself, or his Moravian teachers, or God's dealing with him, were thrust into that high place which pertains alone to the articles of the Catholic, Social, or Humane-universal Creed, in which there is no mention whatever of these individual and self-centred concerns. And in the building of Wesley's societies, which after his death

naturally made themselves sects, these self-centred Individualist Wesleyan doctrines held the place which the Common Faith and the Common Humanity held in Christ's building of His Church. "What is this Methodism," to cite Carlyle again, "but a new phase of Egoism stretched out into the Infinite?" So soon as Wesley's own autocratic hand was removed, the societies which had made him by force a king, assumed to themselves that sovereign power which they had conferred upon him. It was not wonderful that they should separate themselves, or allow their ambitious lay-preachers to separate them from the Common Prayer and the Common Eucharist of the dear Common people of God. The Creed and Sacraments of the Church humbled them to the level of the "publicans and sinners" in every town and village, above whom the Wesleyan dogmas highly exalted them. Those whom he hoped to leave sincere members of the Church had inherited from him little of his filial love for the Mother of us all, but much of his applauded capacity to do all things but obey. They began fierce quarrels amongst themselves, and separations one from another, so that now, as a Wesleyan writer on the Wesley centenary has deplored, the Wesleyan sects suffer (and many a Christian parish suffers still more) the dire misfortune of having, not merely one of Mr. Wesley's preaching-houses, but "two, three, and even four Methodist chapels, and these within a village that could maintain only one in strength and prosperity." "Last week," said the President of the Primitive Methodist Conference, "I was one of four preachers who held four different services in connection with four different denominations in one village, and I should think the total of those congregations would not exceed fifty persons." These men think it a great evil that

the "Nonconformists," as they now absurdly call the Dissenters, should not be united in every village in one "common nonconformity." Yet that the Christians in one parish, already jointed into one common body by the Holy Spirit through the sacrament of the one baptism, should be disunited, so long as Dissenters are the disuniters, they think to be no evil, but the greatest good.

We follow our real King Jesus Christ into His sacred retirement into the mountain, as Quesnel said, when we disappoint the designs which men have of raising and advancing us in the world. It is here, I think, that we see the contrast between Wesley and that far more prophetic man to whom he owed all that was best and most wholesome in his life and work, William Law. What help to-day all over the world God gives through William Law to those who read his books; but who would think of turning to one of the voluminous "works" of John Wesley for aid and light? As a real teacher his brother Charles, through his hymns, has a more lasting place than John Wesley can claim.

We can hardly exaggerate the social evil which is wrought by schism. Our own individual profit is not the only reason why we are called by the Spirit and the Bride to humble our proud heads to the common baptism. We unite in Holy Communion with the common parish and the common nation, with "the publicans and sinners" as Puritan and Methodist pharisaism calls them, that we ourselves may be redeemed and liberated from our own anti-social egoism. We are already in the common unity of parish and fatherland, whether we like it or not, by the Will of the Father, or by what we call necessity. We can only get out of the Divine order which sects call "the world" by getting into some other exactly like it, unless we go

back into savagery and bestiality. The Church sanctifies, by the common baptism and the common eucharist, the social community which she already finds established by the Father. No selfish profit, fancied by us to be heavenly and spiritual, which we think we can gain by separation from the dear common vulgar folk of Christ in parish or nation, and by joining a sect, can possibly compensate for what we must lose by separation, nor for the wrong which we do the godly order of Society, nor for the destruction of other men's faith in the One of whom every family in heaven and earth is named.

LABOUR DAY AND THE RED FLAG ¹

“Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted ; but the rich in that he is made low.”—ST. JAMES i. 9, 10.

THIS passage occurs in the Eucharistic Epistle which is read on the feast of St. Philip and St. James at every altar in all the National Churches of the West. The Church, by the providence of the Father of all, is prepared for all the changes and chances of this mortal life, although we Churchmen are so often blind to this readiness. It is a coincidence not to be ignored, that the first day of May, the joint-festival of these two apostles—probably the most “Hellenic” and the most “Hebraic” of the Twelve—has been celebrated this year, and is certain to be celebrated for many years to come, as a catholic, international, or humane-universal Festival of Labour. These two saints stand forth in the New Testament, however, less as the apostles of the rival intellectual and theological parties in the early Church, than as the apostles of labour and social need. It was to St. Philip that the Liberator of the world first turned, when He saw the dense crowds of the weary and hungry drawing near to the mountain : it was to him that Jesus suggested the first rudiments of the social problem, “Philip, whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?” How distinctive a place

¹ Sunday, May 3, 1891.

St. James holds amongst the social teachers of Christendom, as the pioneer advocate of the rights of the labourer, and the champion of the poor and oppressed, I need not say, for the whole letter out of which the May Day Epistle is taken bears sufficient testimony.

I.

In our native land, as in the other Teutonic lands, whose folk seem less ready than the Latin peoples are to sacrifice a day's wages to ideal holiday-keeping, the Feast of Labour has been wholly, or in great part, transferred, as we see to-day, from the first day of May to the first Sunday in May. This new festival of work, whether kept on May Day or the first Lord's Day in May, has two great objects—first a demonstration of the unity and solidarity which binds, or ought to bind, the wage-workers all over the world; secondly, the use of this demonstration for the shortening of the work day, and for procuring to the workers a more just share of the universe they live in and of the wealth which they are producing. The cynic may point with a cheap and easy sneer, to the quarrels and fightings, by word and blow, which have marked the projected feast of class-unity this year. But it is not a feast for angels, but a feast for men whose conditions of life and work are far from angelic. Moreover, it is not fair to expect the popular agitator to be a greater saint than the popular preacher. It is the temptation of each to lay more stress upon the means than upon the end. He often cares more for the excitement and publicity of the demonstration, and even for what provocation may be given by it, than for the object of the demonstration, for which the weary and heavy-laden (the clients of Christ and His two Apostles) mainly care.

It is important for the worshippers in every parish church to recognise that the final results in time of this new Feast of Labour are bound to be those which St. James prophetically indicates. We are gathered here, not as separatists from humanity, but as the priesthood of humanity—that universal priesthood to which both orders, lay and clerical, and both sexes, men and women, are alike ordained. “God hath begotten us with the Word of His truth,” says St. James to the Church, “that we should be a kind of first-fruits of His creatures.” Every May Day for centuries, in every city and village, at every cathedral and parochial altar in the Western nations, the Catholic Church has been saying—feebly as the utterers or the hearers may have comprehended the whole contents of the sentence of “the Word of Truth”—that the brother of low degree must be exalted, and that the rich must be made low. This is the inevitable end of the long processes and many movements of history, as the Father is directing them by His Word and Son Christ, Jesus the Common Head and Brother of us all; and therefore “the brother of low degree” and “the rich,” as partakers of one faith, are called to “rejoice” together in community at the dispensation of the common Father of both.

The whole stream of historical tendency already indicates that a levelling and equality, such as that over which Christ’s apostle calls poor and rich to rejoice together, must come to pass, though for the time the brother of low degree may regard it with hope, but the rich with doubt and terror. In one sense, as St. James saw, the exaltation of the poor and the making low of the rich had both already occurred evangelically and ideally in the Person of Him in whom the entire history of mankind is summed up and prefigured. All

over the Roman Empire St. James saw a new kingdom and commonwealth growing up, the Church of Christ, within which the brother of lowest degree, the very slave, was exalted by the Sacrament of Baptism to equality and fraternity with the rich, and was rejoicing in the knowledge that he was the child of God, the member of Christ, and the inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. In this new commonwealth also the rich man, hitherto so high in the world's eyes and his own, was rejoicing in that he by his baptism had been made low. He had done what all his rich heathen and philosophical peers thought madness, taken up his cross to follow Christ, and had gained through it a deeper fellowship and unity with the brother of low degree than he had with the class to which he belonged by birth, wealth, or culture. In this spiritual sense the exaltation of the low and the humiliation of the rich had already taken place.

II.

The word which St. James uses to characterise "the brother of low degree" (*ταπεινός*) shows, however, that he is not here spiritualising the contrary estates of poverty and wealth. It describes the outward and material condition of the hopeless slave of the old and the new "civilisation" alike. He is indeed outside civilisation in the proper meaning of the word; he is no *civil* or freeman, but is a "pauper" and "abject." Christ's apostle sees in the "exaltation" of the pauper and the abject man, an event which is alike desirable and inevitable. "Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted." It is as inevitable that this result can only be brought about by the rich being comparatively "made low." The world of man and the world of

nature are in one universal order, the kingdom of God, as Jesus had taught in many parables. So St. James turns to the order of nature in the vegetable world to fetch from thence a parable of this fore-doomed law-determined, and necessary "fading away of the rich man in his ways." For the "ways" of the rich, as St. James shows in so many places in his Epistle, are the seeds which have produced and go on producing the misery and humiliation of the low. The "ways" of the rich man was probably an allusion to the great "journeys" by sea and land, to the whole extant organisation of commerce and enterprise by which riches were gained, and slavery and pauperism increased, in the apostolic age, signs of which must have confronted the apostles of Christ wherever they turned. So indeed St. John seems to hint, when he says in the Apocalypse that at the fall of Babylon—the anti-Christian and the anti-human social mis-organisation—"the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn," and "every ship-master, and all the company in ships, and sailors, and as many as trade by sea." Or the "ways" of the rich man may be all the roads along which he moves to his goal, the whole economy by which a great fortune is gained; or they may be his modes of expenditure, his habits of life, his pleasures, *recreationes*, as Menochius has it. All these are doomed to perish, like the splendour of the flower, not merely by the rich man's own individual death after which he can retain none of them, but by the manifestation of the Son of Man as Judge, in the fulness of the age, when He will appear "for the comfortless troubles' sake of the needy." So whatever degrees in social revolution may be predicted or demanded by the new dogmatic and agitating Scribes and Pharisees of our generation, who reject Christ and His Church, wherever those

degrees are matter of rejoicing and good for the whole human family, there it will be found that Christ and His Church have anticipated them.

Yes, though there is so near a likeness in the end of all things, as foreseen by Christ's apostle and by the anti-Christian or non-Christian agitator, how wide the difference is in the agitation and the preparation for it. It is this difference which accounts for the strangeness of the apostolic counsel. St. James actually urges the rich man to "rejoice" at that which the natural man within him can only regard as the most dreadful of catastrophes for himself and for society. If he be what St. James calls a "double-minded man"—if he looks upon the "low" as his brother in the Church, but in business looks upon him as his mere hand, or in politics looks upon him as his enemy—how will he be able to bear the other's "exaltation," or to "rejoice" in his own humiliation?

St. James is indeed chiefly writing, as the modern social agitator speaks, to "the brother of low degree," and for the labourer. His letter is addressed to the twelve tribes "which are scattered abroad," expatriated, and thereby "in divers temptations." One of their temptations evidently was, as he shows in the next chapter, their inherited tendency to give the rich man precedence, even at common prayer in the common Church, over the poor man. St. James identifies himself throughout his apostolic letter with the poor man and the labourer; he makes their cause his cause. He is kept back by no fear lest his apparent taking of sides should alienate the rich from the common fellowship of the Church, and drive them back into their old Judaism, or Heathenism, or Philosophy, or religion of Art, or idolatry of Money, or worship of Science.

To the one class he says, "Ye have despised the poor." They had been "double-minded"; they had brought with them into the Church the world's pagan and scientific estimate of "the brother of low degree," which we see in the great Aristotle's economical justification of slavery. "Ye rich men, weep and howl," says the apostolical economist, "for the miseries that shall come upon you; your gold and silver is cankered, and the rust of them shall be a witness against you." "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" "Ye have heaped treasures together for the Last Days. Behold, the hire of the labourers, who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth! And the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton." When he calls upon them to "rejoice" in the utter social reversion of these conditions, what does he do but call them to repent of all "the ways," economical, political, or personal, which have produced a state of things so contrary to the Kingdom of the Father and His Christ?

To the other social class he says, "Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seats? Do not they blaspheme that worthy Name by which ye are called?" "If ye have respect of persons, ye commit sin." "My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation."

It seems to me that if we condemn a Socialist or Anarchist agitator, merely upon the ground of the violence or even the apparent savagery of his language, we shall not find it easy consistently to exonerate this holy "servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." If the Epistle of St. James had lain undiscovered until our

century, would not a host of scholars, under the bias of class-sentiment, have doubted its claim to be a primitive document of the Church? Would they not have relied upon the "internal evidence" of the "unchristian" spirit of many of its passages as sufficient justification of their sceptical criticism? You have heard how so great a theologian as Luther, when he found that this Epistle cut across the bias of his theology, in a fit of impatience called it "an epistle of straw."

III.

What then is really the distinction between the apostolic agitator and the new secular agitators, whose language is so like his? The Church asserts, by keeping his festival as a day of rejoicing for every nation and commune, that St. James is the chosen organ of that Eternal Agitator, who is the Author of earthquakes in the material province of His Kingdom and of revolutions in the social and spiritual provinces of it. He was chosen, and ordained, and sent by the Word and Son of the Eternal to declare to the nations that the original Agitator of nature and spirit, of conscience and society, is "the Father of lights," with whom is no respect of persons. His fiery words show how clearly he saw, how deeply he felt, the terrible contrast between rich and poor, employer and wage-worker. This he would have seen and felt, we may believe, had Christ never called him to leave his trade and become an agitator for the Kingdom of God. But he is able to speak so boldly, and is not afraid of being accused of setting the brother of low degree against the rich man, and exciting class against class, because he knows as Christ's apostle that there is a bond of unity between the members

of classes which is deeper than class, in the common Brotherhood of both to Jesus Christ, in the common Childhood of both to the Father. He knows that the rich and the poor to whom he speaks have been alike baptized into the Name which makes them one.

Hence it is that Christ's apostle is able, amidst his severe denunciation of wrong, to keep a firm faith and grasp upon the best article in the creed of the modern Socialist or Anarchist. That article is "Fraternity," or, to speak in our sacred mother-tongue, "Brotherhood." We should be blind indeed if we did not see that it is possible and as frequent for the unbeliever as for the believer to be a Pharisee, and flagrantly to deny in his social life that which he professes in his creed. All men, say they and we in our creeds, are "brothers." But if we depart from the faith, do not they also from their faith? In their creed, by whatever name they call it, all men are "brothers"—brothers because they are men. But in the actual political-social exposition of their creed, in newspapers and at meetings, do they not set up a privileged aristocracy, a schismatic semi-fraternity, an uncatholic church, a kind of Atheist-Calvinist sect? In that strange fatherless and motherless brotherhood, which says it believes in no God, and will have no church, *all* men are not brothers. The sacred privilege is restricted to the wage-earners. All the rich, all the employers, all who owe their ease or their wantonness of life to the hard labour of the poor, are reprobate outsiders and predestinated enemies: they are not brothers and sisters. Hence though they may be ready to follow Christ's apostle by saying "Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted," they are not advanced and liberal enough to go as far as he, and to add, "But let the rich rejoice in that he is made low." For the rich man, in their new fatherless and motherless

world, is not really a man ; for he is not a brother, but a foe and a thief. They have not yet enough of "Liberty" or "Equality" to open to him also the door of "Fraternity." He is like those whom the Puritan doctrine shut out for ever from all possibility of grace, for whom there was no room in the "gathered Churches" of Independency and Anabaptism ; he is beyond conversion ; they look on him as a pest to be destroyed, as the Calvinist soldiers of Cromwell looked on the Popish Irish "Tories," or the soldiers of Mohammed upon "idolaters" and "infidels." His very virtues, if he has any, are but "splendid vices." What would in other men be love and justice, charity and righteousness, are in him mere prudential calculations. The Calvinist anthropology, which has been exorcised from the Church, and is fast being renounced even by the sects which were originally founded as homes for it—Presbyterianism, Independency, and Anabaptism—seems to be seeking a new house in the anti-theological societies of Socialism and Anarchism. That the rich brother should "rejoice" in any state is not in their programme. That he should "rejoice," as Christ's apostle asks, "in that he is made low," as the Eternal Son of God rejoiced when by His incarnation He made Himself poor and low, that He might make the many rich and high—must seem impossible to those who accept the materialist conception of history as dogma. They want him and all his class to suffer, to be punished in the hell of Dives, to pay the uttermost farthing, and to render blood for blood.

I am sure that the new and better conscience, which our whole human kind has from the indwelling Word of God, is not to be reached by so narrow and uncatholic a doctrine of humanity. You cannot separate the rich and poor, the employer and the wage-worker,

because both are *human*. Suppose the poorest man in the world, who is obedient to the universal humane light of Christ within, sees the richest man in the world struck down by some accident, bereaved of wife or child, tortured with pain of body or agony of soul, will he say, It is no matter to me, for he is rich and I am poor? Does not the poor man's heart go out to the rich man? Is not the hand of the feeble, where he is strong and full, stretched out to the help of the strong in his emptiness and desolation? The earth has not yet become a hell, though hell sends up its flames into it. The common Brotherhood, which makes the poor and the rich one, is deeper and stronger than all the dividing accidents of life.

To many of us, priests and lay-folk, the uplifting of the Red Flag on the feast of St. Philip and St. James as an international social flag, as the common standard of the labourer and the expropriated, whosoever may for the hour carry it, is no symbol of division and class-war. The Church knows no classes: she knows only man and one humanity. Red is the colour with which she adorns her parish altars on this festival of the Apostles of Labour. Red is the colour of the stole, the yoke of Jesus, which she puts to-day upon her ministers. When we look at the colour of the flag borne outside the Church, how can we help seeing the concord of the symbolism without and the symbolism within? Its colour reaches to a height and depth, and length and breadth, more Catholic or human-universal than our different social classes are, or even than our different nations are. "God," said the Apostle of Nations, "hath made of *one Blood* all the nations of the earth." The colour of the flag has more to say than is yet dreamed of by the present generation of its bearers. When I take the

red stole from my shoulders, and go from the church into the streets, and

“See the floating standard borne
 By stalwart arms and courage good,
 Red with all the hopes of morn,
 The banner of Man’s Brotherhood”;

when I see the army of wage-workers carrying the flag of the Socialists, the flag of the New Labour Day, the flag of the old festival of the two apostles of labour, how can I be blind to that which struck the German poet, that the flag is, “*Red*, like the *World-Redeemer’s Blood*”?

It tells us not how the rich can help the poor, nor how the poor may help themselves, but how He who made Himself poor for all our sakes, has helped and will help poor and rich as the one family of the One Father. It tells us that the Son of Man is the Judge of rich and poor as men. As it was to the poor St. Philip, one of the Apostles of the May Day festival, that the poor Jesus said, “Where shall we buy bread that these may eat?” so it is by the poor James, the apostolic tribune of the poor and oppressed, and the prophet of revolutionary judgment, that He says to us all, “Grudge not one against another, *Brethren*, lest ye be condemned. Behold, the Judge standeth before the door.”

THE CHURCH AND THE CIVIL SCHOOL¹

“And He saith unto them, Whose is this image and super-
scription? They say unto Him, Cæsar’s. Then saith He unto
them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s
and unto God the things that are God’s.”—ST. MATT. xxii.
20, 21.

WE are happy in that we do not live under a
Cæsar, but in a National State, a Common-
wealth. A Roman Cæsar in the civil order, like a
Roman Pope in the ecclesiastical order, is only
possible so long as the nation or Church is in tutelage,
unfree, or servile. We know that it was a judgment
upon the citizens of the once free commonwealth of
Judah that they should be obliged then and there to
“render unto Cæsar the things” that should have been
the ‘Son of David’s, but which had been made, by the
judicial Word of God, in the history of the nation, “the
things of Cæsar.” “Woe be to the pastors,” says the
prophet in the context of to-day’s Epistle, “that destroy
and scatter the sheep of My pastures, saith the Lord.
Therefore, thus saith the Lord God of Israel against
the pastors that feed My people: Ye have scattered
My flock and driven them away.” If they had been
faithful pastors, the flock would not have come under
the secular and alien rule of Cæsar. We also know
that it was a part of the schooling of the new nations

¹ November 22, 1891 (last Sunday after Trinity).

of Europe, by the living Word of God, that His universal Church for all nations should have its beginning within the secular framework of the quasi-universal Roman Empire.

I.

Nevertheless the Jewish prophet tells the Church in to-day's Epistle that the forced unity in which imperial Egypt had formerly held the congregation of Israel, and imperial Rome was then holding so many nations, congregations, or flocks of the Lord, was a condition by its nature temporary, and doomed to end when the time had fully come. "I will gather the remnant of My flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, neither be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King [instead of a Pharaoh or a Cæsar] shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is His Name whereby He shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness."

I need not say how much more this prophecy means to the Church than it means to the Jews. But it meant this to the Jews, that they should again be a national Free State or Commonwealth, and not one of the subject parts of a huge imperial federation, an Egyptian or a Roman Cæsarism. There is nothing said to all Israel, as a nation or congregation of the Heavenly Shepherd who is the pastor of all peoples and every soul, in this most national of books, which does not

apply to every nation. For a nation is a flock or a congregation called out of some house of bondage, formed into a commonwealth or free state, educated and judged by the living Word of God, as that supreme Pastor and King of whom the Epistle speaks, whose Advent in our flesh the Church is about to celebrate. Hence it is that England daily says, and each parish in England daily says, in the *Venite*, "We are the people of His pasture, and the sheep of His hand."

Few, I suppose, can be ignorant how the text was once interpreted by our fathers in the Church of England. When they saw how Christ's English congregation was in danger of re-subjection to the foreign Papal Cæsar, or of being torn into quarrelling factions by the Separatist sects, they said to the Christian English folk, "Render therefore unto Henry, or unto Elizabeth, or unto Charles the things that are Henry's, or Elizabeth's, or Charles's." The national sovereign was the symbol of the national freedom against the foreign aggressor, and the symbol of the national unity against the domestic sectaries. The Reformers saw in the national kings the true successors of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah. There was no affectation in their comparisons of Henry or Elizabeth with David; we must uncritically idealise David's life, and cut out half of it, if we cannot perceive many of the likenesses which our fathers saw between him and their own Henry VIII. Through the bitter military and civil conflicts which ended with the Revolution, our fathers were taught by the living Word of God that the sovereign is the minister and not the despot of the Commonwealth, subject to law and not above it. This is as truly the product of the living Word of God, the factor of all history, as any event in Jewish history is. Hence I think we do not misinterpret His words when

we say to English priests and people, "Render therefore unto the Commonwealth the things which are the Commonwealth's and unto God the things that are God's."

II.

Our English Commonwealth, late enough in its history, has done a great act of repentance. It has put its own image and superscription upon the civil schooling of the greater part of the people, though it has not yet, as we hope it soon may do, put them upon all our schooling. What I said twenty-one years ago, preaching at St. Stephen's, Lewisham, I say again with even less hesitation to-day—that the great public schools which we see lifting their heads so high above the meaner houses, as we go about London, are the hopeful tokens of a national repentance. Not a few parties and persons are still tempted to cry out—though not so many as in 1870—"Schooling does not belong to the whole National Congregation, Commonwealth, State, or Fatherland. It is not one of 'the things of Cæsar,' but one of 'the things of God.' It belongs rightly to the National Clergy sent by God to teach the nation: it belongs rightly to the Roman Pope: a part of it ought fairly to belong to this faction: a part of it ought by the rules of fair competition to belong to the other." All manner of English Parties and Sects, like the Jewish Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians in the Gospel, would like each to have its own or one another's varying images and superscriptions upon the common civil schooling. There are religious parties which say that the image and superscription ought to be God's; there are secularist parties which say that the image and superscription ought not to be God's. The school is not a sacrament, as one party seems inclined to make it;

neither is it a god, as the other party seems to make it. But if the common civil schooling be honest, if it be straightforward, if it be true in every matter which it handles, it cannot but be God's, exactly as true scales and measures are God's. The honest scales and measures of men who can neither read nor write, but who are resolved to be just, show us that the Word of God is the educator of men. They show us that the eternal and universal Pedagogue, as St. Clement of Alexandria calls Him, has not left and never will leave, even the civil education of consciences, families, parishes, and nations exclusively to schoolmasters. If He did, there could be no education where there is no schooling. If He did, Christ's apostle and evangelist would be mocking the humankind when he says that the Word of God, the True Light, is enlightening every man who comes into the world.

If the education of nations and consciences were left by God to civil schools, then the apostolic writer to the Hebrews would be wrong when he declares that "the Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart; neither is there any creature [social or personal] that is not manifest in His sight: but all things are naked and opened in the eyes of Him with whom we have to do. Seeing then that we have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession."

When Cæsar put his legal image and superscription upon the Jewish tribute-money, he did not thereby say to the Hebrew priests, "You must relinquish your profession; you must not bless the people, nor offer sacrifice for them; I am the Pontifex Maximus!"

Neither did Cæsar thereby say to the Scribes, or to the Pharisees, or to the Sadducees, "You must not any longer explain your laws, nor teach your doctrines, nor gather your disciples." On the contrary, it was Cæsar's own chosen deputy who crucified the One whom the Jewish religious teachers told him was the greatest enemy to their laws, their schooling, and their religion. Far less can it be said that our English Commonwealth, by legally declaring the common civil schooling to be its own proper province as the State or Fatherland, interferes in any way whatever with the Divine rights of the national bishops and priests whom Christ has sent and ordained as the teachers of the nation, nor with the Divine rights of fathers and mothers. Neither does the Commonwealth, by putting its image and superscription upon civil schooling, hinder the rightful liberties of any Scribes, or newspaper men, or Pharisees, or Sadducees, who think themselves to be the best teachers, but it still allows and will allow them to gather as many as they can to their sermons, or lectures, or dreary leading-articles. Nay, may we not expect from what we have learned of the Word of God in English history, that the party-politicians will always be as anxious as Pilate was, for politic ends, to gratify the Pharisees and Sadducees, for the sake of their votes? The sectaries are already asking the civil powers to allow them to hire the civil schools for "religious" use on Sundays, that is, to employ them for seducing the young to forsake or ignore the common worship of their parishes.

Our Commonwealth has simply evolved what is one of the natural and proper functions of every living commonwealth, and will henceforth itself supply what had hitherto been supplied to it and for it by the Catholic Church and other voluntary forces. The civil school is inherent in germ in the national State. It

belongs to every reasonable, religious, and spiritual idea of a national commonwealth that it should become an educator, and teach a true civility to every one of its children and members. What less can we mean when we speak of England as our fatherland, or as our mother-country? As a family is a teacher, so is a State a teacher. Is it the part of the Church to say that the State is a mere material being? Is not the State or Commonwealth, unless every Hebrew prophet was a deceiver and a liar, a spiritual fellowship? Do they not speak of the nation or State as a "congregation," a flock gathered into unity and shepherded by the Lord of spirits? What less did the great Shepherd of souls mean by solemnly uniting Church and State in His commission, by sending His apostolic clergy to "the nations" as such? Or what else do we mean by declaring that Christ's holy baptism belongs to every child that is born in England? The Church in past ages supplied the Commonwealth with civil and secular schooling, just as she supplied it with poor-relief—and with art, music, medicine, logic, rhetoric, grammar, philosophy—because the Commonwealth had not as yet risen to the higher conception, held in trust for the nations by the Catholic Church, that the schooling of all the nation's boys and girls, and the rescue of all the nation's poor from their wretchedness, is a first obligation of the organised public society. I do but repeat what I am so often saying, that to the Catholic Church is committed the highest possible ideal of every form of public organic society; and hence the State still has, and is always likely to have, many a necessary lesson to learn from the Catholic Church as the divine teacher of the nations. Even in the ideal of schooling, the most ignorant priest of a parish is still by his function, whatever he may be by his opinions, far ahead of the

State as a national teacher. For put two public schools side by side—such as Eton College and Harrow School on one side, and a Board School in Whitechapel on the other side—and then compare them with any parish church. In the one school all are “gentlemen,” in the other school none are called gentlemen, but by some uglier name. Whereas if boys from the one and boys from the other meet together in the parish church, the universal human teacher there, as priest of a local commonwealth or parish, is obliged to address them all alike as “dearly beloved *brethren*.” In our different schools we see not yet Caste or Mammon disestablished; whereas in our common or parish church we see Christ’s community and equality already established. There is a sectarianism in our schooling which is impossible in our common worship. Do you think that this old Catholic education, which is independent of schools, and which goes so much deeper and wider than the best civil schooling dares yet to go, is of small worth because it is so familiar? Familiar is the air, familiar is water, familiar is the sunshine; and yet we could not live without them. The profoundest and most precious education in the world is that which, like our Prayer Book, is “Common,” that which we are always ignoring.

“Seeing then that we,” our whole humankind and all the nations in it, “have a great high priest who is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God,” seeing that He is the Word of God by which, as the prophets declare, all the revolutions of political history are ordered and moderated—“let us [who have His baptism and His ordination] hold fast our profession.” The apostles had not a monopoly of the civil schooling, such as our profession once had. I have reminded you already how grievous a failure that very system has

proved, which some amongst us are so eager to keep. The English clergy have schooled and Sunday-schooled the mass of the English poor. With what result? The poor have "lost the tradition of church-going," and what is worse, almost of church-being. "How to retain our elder scholars" is the topic of despondent debates at hundreds of clerical gatherings. I have reminded you how the French Jesuits in the last century had the most consummate system of schooling in the world. With what results? It produced the Encyclopædists and Atheists of the Revolution. Neither had the apostles even one share of the civil schooling, such as some of our profession would now content themselves withal, leaving other shares of it to rival claimants, so affecting that they are no longer the teachers of the nation and the parishes, but are merely the teachers of one of the "Denominations," or sects which divide the national and communal unity in which the Word of God has established us. The apostles had no civil schools and no part in them. Their successors had in all the world to confront an education which was heathen, atheist, or agnostic. Nevertheless they held fast their profession, and proved in the use of it that they were the teachers whom God had sent to all nations.

THE NATIONS' APOSTLE AND OTHER APOSTLES ¹

"Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more."
—2 COR. xi. 23.

PROBABLY nowhere else, within so short a space, is there so much ironical criticism upon men who call themselves apostles and ministers of the gospel, and who are taken for such by those who "suffer fools gladly," as there is in St. Paul's second letter to the Church of Corinth. We should like to have heard the apostle himself apply his principles in detail to some of the rich and mighty newspaper apostles who have lately been the cause of so much noise and stir, so much writing and sight-seeing, amongst the Church and people of England. The Nations' Apostle would find to-day amongst us the same clamorous parties as he found in the Church of Corinth—the politic Roman Cardinal who cries, "I am of Peter"; the wealthy and popular Separatist preacher, with his "thirteen acres of charming grounds," earned by sermons, who says, "I am of Paul";² the autocratic Salvationist Generalissimo, who asserts, "And I am of Christ"; the forward preacher of comparatives, who trades in *newer* methods

¹ February 21 (Sexagesima Sunday), 1892.

² The Rev. Dr. Wright, editorial superintendent of the Bible Society, in the *British Weekly*, February 18, 1892.

and higher criticisms, and profounder views, as he thinks, and says, "I am of Apollos."

I.

First of all, we may be sure, the apostle would have owned all that he saw of the Light and Life of Jesus Christ in every one of them. The objects of the undiscerning flattery of the newspapers and of the newspaper school of preachers are men, and therefore to be loved and honoured. He rejoiced when any men preached Christ anywhere and to anybody, even though they preached Him of contention. I do not care to hide my own belief that Popish preaching, Anabaptist preaching, and Salvationist preaching, in the sight of the Apostle of the Nations, would have seemed contentious preaching.

Widely as these parties differ from one another, they are ceaselessly bedaubing one another with praises. But that there is more contentiousness than charity in these tributes of admiration is evident from the fact that the praises are always tied up with a depreciation of the national bishops and priests. "The three most important religious demonstrations lately held," says a daily organ of the capitalist party in politics, "have been in honour of persons who are distinctly outside the Church of England."¹ The size and stir of Cardinal Manning's funeral, in comparison with the sobriety of Archbishop Tait's funeral, is cited by the most preposterous of pressmen, seated in "the Vatican, London," as a proof that the Pope's "Archbishop of Westminster," and not the nation's "A. C. Cantaur," was the true primate of England, and the real successor of Anselm and Becket.²

¹ *Daily News*, February 12, 1892.

² *Review of Reviews*, February, 1892.

The object of these three sorts of preaching—the Popish, the Puritan, and the Methodist—is fundamentally the same, and they are really but three varieties of what the apostle calls “another gospel.” Hence there is more affinity between the three, unlike as they seem upon the surface, than there is between either of them and the gospel of the Nations’ Apostle, or between either of them and that gospel which the Church of England exhibits by being catholic and national. Neither of them recognises the sanctity of the fatherland, in nation and parish, wherein the Father has established us, and whereof He has made us very members incorporate. Consequently each of these “apostles,” whose praise is in the newspapers, is obliged by his “gospel” to carry on a war of contention against the nationality and against the neighbourly communality of the Kingdom of Christ. They preach or fight in order to separate as many souls as they can from that Kingdom which is older than the Church, that Kingdom into which Christ Himself was born as a citizen of Judah, as a villager of Nazareth, and over which He was exalted as King at His ascension, and to which He sends His apostles with His baptism and discipline. This godly universal order they hold to be merely natural, or secular, or national, or parochial; some sectaries even hold it to be diabolical, or at best worldly. So they “preach Christ of contention,” eager to carry souls away as conquered prisoners out of this kingdom into the empire of the Pope, or into some Protestant sect, or into the dynastical Army of the Booths. “They think of us,” says the Apostle of Nations, “as if we walked according to the flesh.”

The adulators of “false apostles” in the newspapers, and the party-politicians who offer educational or other civil bribes to the “false apostles” to get the votes and

interest of their disciples at the next election, criticise the simple ordinary parish priests, by whose daily work, unpraised by men, Christ is leavening millions of lives, and is holding the nation together, exactly as the Apostle of the Nations says he was criticised in Corinth. "His bodily presence is weak," say they, "and his speech contemptible." What they said may have been true. If so, St. Paul represents the thousands of every-day priests and laymen, each quietly doing his own work in his own place. As they hear the noisy plaudits around the idols of the market-place, they are forced to demand of the Church, with the Nations' Apostle: "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more."

Yes, "more"; "more" in the character of his work; "more" in the rewards of it; "more" in the authority whence it comes. If an apostolic man dies, who has been loyal to the National Church, and has not gained high place or fortune by seceding from the English household of faith, bishops and archdeacons do not waste upon him any of the praise they heap profusely upon a Newman, or a Manning, or a Spurgeon. Have we not seen it in our own days?

When Maurice died, a man who had indeed come forth from God, and by whom God has turned all English Christianity into its new and socialist direction, the bishops and archdeacons held their tongues.

St. Paul meekly accepted the Corinthian criticism upon himself. Nevertheless he drew upon his own great reserve of irony, which he ordinarily kept under restraint, and gave them back measure for measure. "For we," says he, speaking for himself and his own son in the Faith, "dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves. But

they, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise. But we will not boast of things beyond our measure, but according to the measure of the Canon" (for that is the word he uses, which we translate "rule") "which God hath distributed to us, a measure to reach even unto you. For we stretch not ourselves beyond our measure." The tenth and eleventh chapters are full of light and correction for the Church whenever or wherever she is tempted to be led astray by the noise and bluster and big shows of the hour, or to turn her back upon a quiet Paul or a modest Titus, and follow such as he calls "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ."

II.

But, exclaim the Corinthians, have you read the eulogies in the newspapers? Have you heard the sermons by the newspaper preachers, not merely in meeting-houses and churches, but even in the cathedrals—not only from Papists and Separatists, but even from the successors of the Apostle of Nations? Have you seen the enormous size and costliness of the shows, on sea and on land, and the countless multitudes which thronged to gaze at them? Has there been anything equal in the same way since the funeral of Tom Sayers, the great pugilist? And you dare to say that men who can command "demonstrations" so imposing, and sermons so panegyrical, are "false apostles"?

"And no marvel," the apostle answers for himself, and for us. "For Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers"—who are not evil spirits as he is, but are men as we are, and therefore enlightened by the Holy Spirit—"also be

transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be," like the end of all other men, "according to their works."

Every man who speaks and works for righteousness and soberness, even though he preaches Christ of contention, is a minister of Christ. Nay, the Lord shows us, in his description of the Judgment of the Nations, that every one who does an act of mercy, though he never preaches, and avoid public committees, is a minister of Christ. Cardinal Manning, like so many other Englishmen, was full of chivalry and pity. Mr. Spurgeon, like so many other Englishmen, was instinct with honesty and straightforwardness. Every chivalrous, pitiful, straightforward man or woman, about whom the world makes no noise, is to that extent a "minister of Christ," and "a minister of righteousness," though otherwise labouring for the false unity of the Pope's empire, or for the false spirituality of Sectarian separation. Such graces could not be in them, nor be ministered by them to others, unless the life and light of Jesus Christ, the head of every man, had been imparted to them.

So much the Nations' Apostle grants as to the preachers of "another gospel," in Corinth. But he hastens to say that he regards himself and Timothy ("fool" as the Corinthians may think him) to be the ministers of Christ in another and a fuller sense. "I speak as a fool: I am more." "I say again, Let no man think me a fool." St. Paul knew, however, that the Corinthians would so think him, and therefore, he grimly added, "If otherwise, yet as a fool receive me."

It needs an apostolic "boldness" not to fear being thought "a fool," or being thought a bigot. Let us at least be honest, even though the Corinthians call us fools and intolerant. For what, to use for an instant the cant of the *Zeitgeist*, must be "the message" of a

Roman Cardinal to the city of Corinth or to the Commonwealth of England? What must be "the message" of a preacher of Anabaptism? It is nothing to the purpose to say they were good men. It is nothing to the purpose to say, as many do, that such a man is better than his creed. This may be the self-satisfied expression of our conceit that his creed is far inferior to our creed. It is the sorrow of every good man that he has never yet been as good as his creed. Every man's creed, that which he indeed believes, is constantly bringing him into judgment for falling so short of it in his deeds. It is nothing to the purpose to say that they were successful, and that they had their reward—great place and pomp in this present evil world, or great influence and popularity in this present evil world. The thing really to the purpose is, what did they tell you and me and all mankind? What was their creed?

Manning's "message" was that we are all outside the Church of Christ, and that to get within it we must supplement Christ's sacrament of baptism with the super-sacrament of individual submission to the Bishop of Rome, and to such functionaries as he may be pleased to send to be our bishops. Corinth, according to one part of its "false apostles" was outside the commonwealth of Christ, until every one of its citizens said, "I am of Peter." You must all submit to the holy mother-mistress Church of Jerusalem, and supplement your baptism with her circumcision. The English nation, and every English commune, said Manning, is outside the Catholic Church of Christ, and will remain outside until Englishmen say, "Whosoever is forced by the international caucus of Cardinals upon the poor, unfree local Church of Rome is its bishop: he is 'Peter'; and to him every soul in England ought to be subject. He is the infallible judge in faith and morals." Baptism, which was the

Corinthian's witness to his freedom from the Jerusalem below, as the Apostle of Nations taught, is the Englishman's witness to his freedom from Rome, which is but a poor caricature of Jerusalem.

"By one Spirit," said Paul to the Corinthians, "are we all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free," and that baptism is as independent now of Rome as it was then of Jerusalem. That sacrament, as the Lord said at the institution of it, belongs to "all nations."

Mr. Spurgeon's "message," as the newspapers call it, was fundamentally as negative as Manning's, and equally contradictory to the Gospel of the Nations' Apostle. When he first began to preach in London I was taken by some friends, who were Baptists, to hear the new young orator, of whom they were naturally proud. I do not remember a word of his sermon; but one sentence in his prayer before the sermon, which was somewhat defiantly uttered, made an impression upon me which I have never forgotten. It ran thus: "O Lord, give us back our good old-fashioned Calvinist theology!" I honour Calvin as much as any man; and I hope that I am not blind to the good, as well as the evil, which Europe and America owe to him. But the English Church and nation had scarcely completed their freedom from Rome when they were threatened with a hardly less fearful bondage to Calvinism. Mr. Spurgeon's "Calvinism" never had the ferocity of the men whom he admired as theologians—the men who murdered Archbishop Laud, who robbed England of holidays, who deprived the common people of the Common Prayer, who abolished Christmas, battered down cathedrals and theatres, who drove out priests and players, who established a cruel Sabbatarianism, destroyed the "merriment" of England, and built up

a new landlordism out of the plunder of the Church and the poor. His doctrine grew milder and more liberal as he grew in the practical knowledge of men. With an irony not unlike St. Paul's, he said that he had dismissed three "holiness men" whom he had employed as gardeners, and instituted three "sinners," and that he found the sinners to be more conscientious workmen. Nevertheless he was obliged to tell our fatherland, and every parish in it, that it was not the family of God, but that only those who by their own "conversion" separated themselves from the nation and the communes were the true children of God. It is only just to say that he as rigorously excommunicated himself from Christianity until he was "converted," as he excommunicated the majority of the nation and the race. Preaching at a new chapel in a parish "in which Ritualism abounded," he told his hearers that when he was at school the clergyman said to him, "What is your Christian name?" He replied: "I have not any Christian name; I wish I had. I am not a Christian." The clergyman said, "My dear boy, are you a heathen?" He answered: "I almost wish I were: I should not then have the responsibility of living in a Christian land and not being converted." If he had been a true Calvinist he would have known that the responsibility was God's and not his own, for unless he belonged to the predestinated number of the elect, his conversion was impossible. He added that he had not "the impudence to mock God by addressing Him as 'Our Father which art in heaven,' when he felt that he was the child of the devil." ¹

This unapostolical, anti-national, and anti-social theology was the germ of the sermons whose wide circulation over the globe was so profitable to the trade,

¹ *The Christian World*, November 7, 1873.

and which have called forth the eulogies of newspaper men and Church dignitaries. Nothing less than St. Paul's own irony could bring out the full contrast between these sermons of commercial Babylon and his own sermons. His sermons, as he tells the Church in the indignant autobiographical which she uses to-day as her Epistle, brought him the persecution of the religious world (the cruellest of all the forms of the world which we renounced at our baptism): they brought him floggings on his bare body, the necessity of working for his daily bread, and hardly getting that; his sermons brought him into hunger and thirst, into fastings also, into cold and nakedness.

Some perverted form of Calvinist election and reprobation was no doubt one of the false gospels which the Corinthians had preferred to the gospel of the Nations' Apostle. St. Paul taught them that the childhood of God and the childhood of the devil are not two several persons, but the two contrary births and lives of which every person, some time or other, is conscious in himself, whether Jew or Greek, faithful or infidel. Christ, the author of the Divine birth in consciences and nations, by sending His apostles with His baptism and His discipline to all nations and to every creature, declared in action, as He had done by word in the parable of the Prodigal Son, that the childhood of God is the true and real childhood in every Corinthian and every Englishman.

III.

Whether we like it or not, we are obliged by our calling as the priests of the nation, to assert that we have a kind of ministry which is "more," as the Nations'

Apostle says, than the ministry of nation-dividing and parish-dividing apostles. Whatever truths they may speak, or whatever good they may do, we are bound to own in England, as St. Paul did in Corinth. But "though I should boast somewhat of our authority, which the Lord hath given us for edification, and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed." The authority of our ministry no more depends upon the recognition of it by newspapers or by parliaments than the authority of St. Paul's apostleship depended upon the votes of the Corinthians. Our business in the nation and its communes and families is not to satisfy newspapers, nor so to conduct ourselves as to get influence amongst political wire-pullers, and preserve the endowments of those of our order who are endowed. Our business in England, like his in Corinth, is to liberate consciences from all tyrannies; it is to "endeavour to keep men within that divine unity of national fatherland and communal neighbourhood and family order wherein the Father has already established them, and wherein His Spirit was educating them before He manifested His Son to the nations, and sent forth His apostles with the Catholic baptism and the Catholic discipline of which we are the ministers: it is to cultivate in men that catholic humanity by which the Father has made them members of a greater society than the nation, or commune, or family. What the tyrannies are to which they are subject who reject the Nations' Apostle for other apostles St. Paul tells the Corinthians in many parts of his letters, and in to-day's Epistle he counts up five of them. "For ye suffer if a man bring you into bondage: if a man devour you: if a man talk of you: if a man exalt himself: if a man smite you on the face."

It is too late here to show how history, as the con-

tinuous Word of God, prove these to have been again and again the results of substituting the false unity of the Roman Popedom, or the false spirituality of Sectarianism, for that unity in which the Father has established us, and for that common Spirit which He has "poured out upon all flesh."

PRIESTS AND POLITICAL PARTIES †

“Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother’s eye.”—ST. LUKE vi. 42.

IN these words the Saviour of mankind and the true Head of every nation in whom the men and citizens of the most contrary parties have unity, detects and condemns that evil spirit of division which rages and seems to rule at times like the present. It sounds like the satire of the eternal Word of God, the ultimate factor of history, upon our Parliamentary elections, as they are now conducted. For who sees not that it is the chief business of the agent and slave of a political party, and indeed that he regards it as his very duty, to be what our Blessed Lord calls a “hypocrite”? He uses pen and tongue, and newspaper and placard, “first” to deny that there is any beam in his own eye, and thereupon to show to his fellow-citizens how huge a mote there is in his brother’s eye; or perhaps he invites them to curse and rail at his brother for having a mote in his eye. Jesus says that every such speaker or writer, whether he calls himself Pharisee or Sadducee, a Liberal or a Conservative, is a “hypocrite.” He is a man playing a part upon a stage, laying aside for the moment, and for the action, his own true self; that is,

† Fourth Sunday after Trinity, July 10, 1892.

his share in the common and indivisible Humanity which he and all men have in Christ. He is blinded by his own hypocrisy, Jesus says, by a beam in his own eye. And what is the name of this blinding beam? It is "Party." The Saviour saw that the misery and degradation of His own nation were due to the blindness of the parties which divided it, political and religious. All His awful "Woes" were delivered against these parties, none of which had any place or name in the real divine constitution of Israel any more than our political parties of Whig or Tory, Liberal or Conservative, or other such sects, have any place or name in the constitution and statutes of England, or any more than our ecclesiastical parties of High, Low, or Broad have any place or name in the creed or canons of the Church of Christ. Yet men fancy that these unreal divisions, both in Church and Commonwealth, are the real branches and members of each. It has often been noticed that the Saviour uttered no "Woe" against the national priests. Why? Because, notwithstanding they were most cruel enemies to Him and His work, they had a name and place in the godly and humane order of the fatherland. The priests of Jewry were by their office witnesses, as the leaders of the Jewish sects and parties were not, to that unity and brotherhood in which the Father had established the whole nation. The priests might individually be Pharisees or Sadducees; they might individually care more for the triumph of their party than for the health and wealth of the whole common People; they might pretend that the health and wealth of the Nation could only be obtained by the blind Liberal Sadducee crushing the blind Conservative Pharisee, or by the blind Tory Pharisee keeping the blind Radical Sadducee out of all places of power and profit in the State. But as

priests they were against party, and for the nation. They were the witnesses and the ministers of the great national community and fellowship which included the members of all parties. As priests they were obliged to bless all the organical people, and not merely the mechanical party of the Pharisee or the mechanical party of the Sadducee. The Pharisee who was a priest had in his sacerdotal character and function to bless the very Sadducees, whom he cursed in his party character ; and the Sadducee who was a priest had in the same way, however grudgingly, to bless the Pharisees as integral members of the elect people of God. As national priests they were obliged to offer the Divine sacrifice for the entire national congregation of the Lord. It was their function as priests to absolve all the citizens from their sins. So the priests were obliged to deny in God's name the first assumption of each party, that transgression is a characteristic solely of the other party ; that its members have no beams in their own eyes, and consequently have title and power to point out, if not to pull out, each ugly and wicked mote that is in their brother's eye, or, as they prefer to say, in the " enemy's " eye.

II.

You will observe what it is which the Judge and Saviour of the nations here does. He rejects our nomenclature and substitutes His own. He calls that man " hypocrite " or play-actor, whom we call a " noble champion," " our glorious leader," the politician or religionist " whose heart is in the right place." That which we call magnificent insight, or foresight, or clearness of vision in such a man, Jesus Christ calls a blinding beam in that man's eye. The astute wire-puller of one of our political parties gives this cruel title

of "enemy" to his "brother" in the other party. I need not say for which party he rages, since the Church knows nothing of citizens under their self-made separations into Pharisees and Sadducees, or into Conservatives and Radicals, but knows them only within their God-given constitution as men and citizens. The wire-puller of party, who has no name for his "brother" in the opposite political camp but that of "the enemy," thinking that he saw signs of quarrel inside one of the dark anti-Christian camps of his own party, adopted the words of Nelson to some naval officers who had fallen out, "Gentlemen, there is the enemy; shake hands." We priests should not only be hypocrites, but apostates, if we did not at such a time as this remind the Lord's congregation that Christ the Lord gives deliberately the name of "thy brother" to that very man whom the Antichrist of Party urges and inspires you to regard as "the enemy." As we have been called, ordained, and sent by Jesus Christ to His parishes in their entirety, and to His whole English nation, that we may bless *all*, that we may offer and present before the Father the common Sacrifice of all and for all, and that we may absolve all of their transgressions in His name and with His power and authority, so we shall be traitors to Jesus Christ, and to His whole congregation in parish and State, if we side as priests with either of the parties which pervert into "enemies" those whom He has called and established into a brotherhood. It seems to me more Christian to vote for a man than for a party, as we see in that classical instance of the people's voting St. Ambrose into the bishopric of Milan.

III.

The Lord does not merely warn us, however, that to be saved from "hypocrisy," and to take our standing

upon the fixed foundation of truth and reality, we must renounce our nomenclature, which is of the old man, and adopt His nomenclature, which is of the new man created after God in Christ Jesus. He goes on to tell us what we are "first" or at once to do. We are to substitute His godly and humane order of time for our anti-Christian order of time. He tells us to put first things first. So long as the Radical is looking "first" for the mote in the Tory's eye, or the Conservative is looking "first" for the mote in the Liberal's eye, each is blind, each is a "hypocrite," each is putting the second thing in the first place. It is more important to the whole family of the State for me to be right and clear-sighted than to prove to as many as I can that the other man is wrong and blind. That which seems on the surface to be merely individual to you or me is fundamentally social. I serve all society by casting this beam of prejudice out of my own eye.

"Cast out first," says the common Saviour, to Liberal and Conservative alike, "the beam out of thine own eye: and then shalt thou see clearly." The newspaper—the holy bible of each party—tells its own blind partisan that there is no beam in his eye; if there were, he would not see so clearly as he does "the mote in his" enemy's "eye." The "first" thing, says the Devil's Unholy Scripture, alike in the Tory and Radical translations of it, is to get our enlightened and faultless party in power and place at all costs. The simple sheep of each party, who run and vote in a flock as they are told, are honestly fascinated by the ideal of the party, and suppose that its loftiness is a palliation for the bad morals of electioneering. The ideal is always sure to be high and noble. That was as true of the ideals of Pharisee or Sadducee as it is of those of Tory or Radical. There always is something precious in the

nation, the preservation of which to our children is worth all our pains and struggles; hence it is just and rational that a Christian should be a Conservative. There is always an accumulation of vile and corrupt roots in the soil of the fatherland, and these must develop hideous growths, which will be a curse to our children if they are allowed to remain; hence it is righteous and reasonable that a Christian should be a Radical. But he may be both, and may be both at once, and yet remain firm in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and not sell himself into bondage to either of the parties which pretend a monopoly of those qualities of which they so impertinently usurp the titles. This monopoly of what is not exclusively ours is the very thing which Christ, our Judge and Deliverer, calls "hypocrisy." Hence it is that I am so glad that He in these last days, in His character as Redeemer of all society, has called into the field of politics the long silent and oppressed estate of Labour. I will not say that He has founded a Labour "party." Labour is for *all*: by it all live. So I can no more regard the godly estate of Labour than I can regard the holy order of the Priesthood, as a mere party. If the wage-worker sells his soul to a party, he will have the same condemnation as the priest who becomes the slave of a party. Has not the Lord already given us signs, as the world's all-ruling King, that to this estate of Labour He has entrusted the redemption of all other estates in the Commonwealth from their present miserable captivity to the immoral and anti-social parties of the "Ins" and the "Outs"? Oh may they be faithful, as the apostles were, to so great and world-wide a trust. It is the "first" necessity of the Christian mind to look for the very best in the side or interest opposed to his inclination. We own this in

the Church whenever we speak of the reconciliation of the parties and sects by which the "one body" of the baptized is now outwardly divided. It is morally impossible to separate Church and State, so inextricably has the Father of both united them. Ought we not to extend the same principle to the State? A Christian Radical should be much more concerned at the beam in his own eye than at the mote in his Tory brother's eye. Why should political life be thought the one part of life from which Christ and His Law are to be excluded? So a Christian Conservative, if he yields himself to be led by Christ's Spirit, will be "first" eager to see and discover the signs of Christ's mind in all the schemes and plans of his Radical brother. How wide and inexhaustible are the contents of that "Salvation" which the world's Redeemer brings! To be "saved" is at the same time the liberation, emancipation, and making whole which is the ideal of the revolutionist in politics, and also the preservation of everything that is precious, which is the ideal of the Conservative in politics. Every parish in England is praying this week that God being our Ruler and Guide, we English citizens may so pass through things temporal that we finally lose not the things eternal. "Things temporal" is a name which we justly give to our political life. "The things eternal," our common Fatherhood and Brotherhood now revealed to all nations by God in Christ Jesus our Lord, by which those who split themselves and their neighbours into wrangling parties, struggling to disgrace and outwit one another, are nevertheless really, inwardly, and spiritually held together in one communion and fellowship by Him of whom every fatherland in heaven and earth is named.

THE LENTEN FAST ¹

“Blow the trumpet in Zion; sanctify a fast; call a solemn assembly; gather the people; sanctify the congregation; assemble the elders; gather the children.”—*JOEL* ii. 15.

“But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head and wash thy face, that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which seeth in secret.”—*ST. MATT.* vi. 17.

ONE of these passages occurs in the Epistle, and the other in the Holy Gospel, which were read before the common altar of the parish on “the first day of Lent, commonly called Ash Wednesday.” What democratic and catholic significance lies in the phrase “commonly called,” which is repeated so often in our English Book of Common Prayer, I shall hope to show you on another Sunday. I have not joined together these two Ash Wednesday texts to-day in order to preach upon them, for each is full enough of matter to occupy a preacher throughout the whole season; but rather because their junction on the first day of the fast indicates what the whole of the fast ought to contain and to be.

The two aspects of Lent, the national and the personal, either of which can so easily be magnified to the neglect of the other, are combined before the altar of every parish on the first day. There and then the Church associates the words of the Lord’s prophet

¹ February 11, 1894.

to the whole national community with the Lord's own words to the personal conscience. The Word of God, which was uttered by the prophet Joel to the Commonwealth of Judah, and is now self-uttered to all nations in the person of the incarnate and universal Son, is the Eternal Word, as His Church dogmatically teaches. To confess Jesus as the Eternal Word is to say that He always was, as well as is, God's Word to and in all; and therefore we may be sure that the people and priests of the nation who heard the prophet's words upon the fast, must also have heard His inward and ever-speaking word to the conscience on the true and the false fasting. This indeed the prophet implied by saying in the Epistle exactly the same thing as Jesus says in other words in the Gospel: "Rend your hearts, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God."

I.

Some of us have been preaching Lent after Lent, for near a quarter of a century, the doctrine which the Church places in the forefront on the first day of Lent, not only by the choice of the Epistle, but by the whole contents of the Commination Office. That doctrine is that Lent is a season set apart by Christianity for the discovery, denunciation, confession and amendment of our open social sins; and it is therefore, according to the Church, a fast for the entirety of every nation, city, and parish in Christianity. The dominant words in the Epistle, "Zion," "Assembly," "The People," "The Congregation," are all social phrases; "the Elders" and "the Children" include all the states of social life. The Scribes and Pharisees of those newspapers which profess righteousness, and care for the poor, as Judas did, with their customary ignorance of

the Church, and their intolerance toward her clergy as such, pretend that such a use of Lent is a "novel innovation." But this use of Lent is not made merely by the sermons of those priests, few or many, who intentionally adopt and vindicate it. They are simply conforming to the Church which these newspapers ceaselessly denounce. Every priest makes this use of it. For the Church, as the mother and mediatrix of all that are desolate and oppressed, has taken care by her parochial offices for Lent that every priest as such shall in every parish make this social use of it. I have much more horror of the exceptional praise with which a Party may belaud some of us, when it supposes we are helping its worldly ends, than I have of its chronic intolerance towards the whole estate of the national clergy.

The social aspect of Lent used to need all the greater emphasis at the time when we began to bring it out of the Church's unchanging offices into our ever-changing sermons, because Socialism did not then wear silver slippers, and dine at rich men's tables, and brought reproach instead of reputation. Besides, most of our order, as was natural to the pastors of local flocks, were ignoring the wide and deep social purposes of Lent in their anxiety for the moral health of those whom they best knew, the persons directly committed to their charge. Even those who thought most seriously of the corporate life of the Church, like the Oxford Reformers, did not perceive how inseparable it is from the corporate life of the commonwealth; and so they mainly urged their hearers to use Lent as a time for each one of them to examine and forsake his own individual sins against God and his neighbour which are so often not open, but known only to his Father who seeth in secret. This is why they said

with so much emphasis, echoing the Pastor and Bishop of all souls, Who both unites all and isolates each, "But *thou*, when *thou* fastest."

To use Lent merely or mainly for the denunciation of sins we are not inclined to, or are not likely to be in a position to commit—whether they be the class sins of Tory landlords or the class sins of Radical capitalists, or the class sins of drunkards, company promoters, and gamblers—is to narrow one of the most precious institutes of the human-universal fellowship, the Catholic Church, to the pharisaic service of a sect or a party. The Church is the city of refuge for common society and the common conscience alike from the many Sects which rend religion and the two Parties which rend politics. Hence it is an obligation of the state of the clergy, as I think, towards every other "state of life" in the commonwealth, to avoid the possible degradation of their Lenten sermons to the quarrelsome level of leading articles in a political Party-newspaper, or of speeches from a political Party-platform, whose ends are not the same as the ends of the common Church—namely the spiritual healing of the commonwealth and all its members, but rather the quack pretence that it can only be healed by securing the mechanical triumph of one political camp over another. The seed of all class and party sins, from the worrying of a rat to the crucifixion of a martyr, lies deep in every self. Lent recalls us to the moral A B C, that every such seed must be anti-socially fertile and reproductive until self in all and each is put under Christ the Lord.

Lent is indeed both national and personal, a time for open denunciation and inward amendment. The two things may be separable in public, but they are inseparable in the sight of the Father of all and each,

who seeth in secret. His sight of our "secret" is given as part of the Gospel, or glad tidings to all mankind. Hence every one who denounces ought to make quite sure in secret of his call and mission. He ought to examine himself and see how far he is qualifying himself for so awful a work. Moses obtained the right to denounce Pharaoh by first making the great renunciation: he "refused to become the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the People of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." Christ our Lord first emptied Himself, "made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Himself the form of a slave," "though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor," before He said to the rich and full and life-enjoying men of other classes, "Woe unto you that are rich! Woe unto you that are full! Woe unto you that laugh now! Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you!" Yes, I see clearly how to call upon landlords and capitalists to renounce the spoiling of the people of God, and perhaps I can make an income, a reputation, and a career by doing it. I can earn two or three guineas from the plutocratic owner of a newspaper by denouncing the riches of an archbishop: I can write a laudatory article upon St. Francis of Assisi in a comfortable study under the inspiration of a bottle of champagne. But the remorseless Word of God will come to me also, and demand in secret, "What and where hast thou yet renounced?"

II.

The first day of Lent brings afresh to our sight the impassable gulf betwixt the morality of the Church and that of every Party, whether political or ecclesiastical. It lies in the absolutely contrary attitude which each is

obliged to take towards sin ; but are equally fervid, or ought to be, in their denunciation of sins. But what does each mean by "sins"? A sin, according to the teaching of every Party, is something altogether outside its own tent, and never to be found inside it—except when one of its own adherents turns apostate, and joins the other Party. The man may be impelled by conscience or by interest: God alone knows by which. But thenceforward he will be stigmatised as a Judas in the camp which he has forsaken, and as the one most sinful man in all the land. For who does not see that sin is assumed by the Scribes and Pharisees of Party to be a property exclusively inherent in the other Party? The hardest conflict of the Church must always be with Party, more even than with class, though the Church, as the one common fellowship, can acknowledge neither classes nor parties. A class, however, does at times good-humouredly or patronisingly concede the existence of some good and right in other classes; but all the eloquence and wit of Party are put to the stretch in casuistical efforts to prove that even the right done by the other Party is wrong, and that the truth uttered by it is false.

A Party Lent, if we could imagine so strange an institution, could scarcely be used for the self-examination and confession of the Party's own misdeeds; it would be restricted to the numbering and denunciation of the sins of its hinderers and opposers. A Party thanks whatever it does thank, that it is not as that other Party. Thus the common democratic conscience of England perceived that the State-imposed "Fast and Humiliation Days" of the Long Parliament, the Rump "Commonwealth," and the Cromwellian Cæsardom, were the exact contrary to the old humane-universal Lent, which was and is the fast for the organic entirety

of each national and parochial community. Those dreadful Lents and Comminations of the tyrannical "Nonconformist conscience" were not only mere Party fasts, but were what the prophet calls "fasts for strife and debate," as any one may see who will read in modern light the official "Fast Sermons" preached to the State authorities at Westminster Abbey, St. Margaret's, and Whitehall Chapel, by their Nonconformist and Separatist chaplains; or the amazing seven "Motives" which Cromwell gave in his proclamation for a fast to secure God's help in his unjust war against Spain. A fast perverted to Party uses cannot bring forth the humble confession and amendment of the whole fellowship, which is the end of Lent, but can only produce self-righteous blindness and self-justifying reprisals. "I ask," said an English patriot who had observed the immoral fruits of those Party fast-days of the seventeenth century, "whether the holy Name of God hath not been mightily profaned by the fasts which the people of this nation have been forced to observe, even against their hearts, souls, and consciences? How did the Parliament at first enforce the people of this nation to fast and pray for the defence of Religion, King, Parliament, Laws, and Liberties? And did not the King, at the same time, command that part of the nation under his command to fast and pray for his contrary forces, as fighting upon the very same grounds and causes?" This was in 1652. We are now far enough from these two Parties to see that the parliamentary league of greedy Landlords and bigoted Liberationists in one camp, and the wilful national king and his followers in the other camp, were alike in need of a common and catholic fast like Lent, wherein each might confess their own sins, instead of denouncing the sins of the other.

III.

The Church, as the mother of us all, whatever be our Party in Church or commonwealth, calls every one to come for forty days out of the narrow bounds of Party, and look in a sincere and unbiassed light at our relations to that great and all-including fellowship for whose health and wealth every Party affects to exist and work. Yes, Party is that anti-Christian Babylon out of which the Lord calls His whole people, as a whole, by the Lenten trumpet in Sion. Hence, I cannot but think that to spend Lent in the mere denunciation of sins outside us, and from which we are able to clear and comfortably absolve our own selves as innocent, and to neglect spending it in the examining, confessing, and amending of our own contribution to the sins of the Church and the Commonwealth, is to waste it. It perverts, as I have said, a common Churchly, Catholic, a humane-universal institute into a class and sectarian institute. If Lent be not only a national fast, but also a personal fast for every citizen in Christianity, it must be as needful and wholesome for the proudest and most pharisaical newspaper editor, as it is for the most modest bishop, whom he denounces, as his foregoers did the Lord Christ, as "a friend of publicans."

For when we turn from the cruel Parties to the Church, the tender mother of us all, and ask her what sin is, and where it is, how does she reply? We behold her lying in the dust, with the ashes of Lent upon her sacred head. The Church, as the mother of us all, knows nothing of our self-made classes and parties, she knows only God-made men, women, and children. Where is sin? What is sin? "Sin," the Church confesses afresh on every first day of Lent, "is in me and in you. Do not look out so eagerly and inhumanly for

sin in others. Sin is the horrible thing which you and I are committing against God and against our neighbour." Surely it may moderate both our anger and our wonder at the rage of the Scribes of the Party newspapers, and of the Pharisees of the Party platforms and conventions, against the bishops and priests of the Church, if we will but recollect that they can never say anything more bitter against us than the Church urges us to confess to the Father and to His holy congregation against ourselves. Illiberal and malicious as they are, they tell the truth about us! What is most to be dreaded, is not their blame but their praise, lest it should bring us under that sentence of the Lord, when "He lifted up His eyes on His *disciples* and said: 'Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! For so did their fathers to the false prophets.'"

Denunciation of the social sins of our neighbours is tolerable where it is the Father of all who says, "Cursed are they," and where His priest officially repeats His word, and applies it to the common conscience, as in the Communion office, of which I have so often spoken, and hope to speak later. But it is an intolerable pharisaism, and brings the denouncer under Christ's commination, when and where it is separated from the search after, the confession, and the reparation of our own personal sins. "Except your righteousness," said Jesus to the "multitudes" of His nation and age, "shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." The ideal commonwealth, the kingdom of heaven on earth, is for "the multitudes," as its King declares. But it cannot be realised or entered into by the multitudes—as the parties which divide and rend the actual commonwealth pretend and promise that it can—through the immoral and mechanical process of

any one Party out-witting, out-bribing, out-voting, confounding and crushing any other Party. It can only be realised or entered into upon earth, as every Lent reminds us, by the new creation of ideal men, women, and children. That new creation, as the Apostle of the Commonwealth told the Ephesians, is the evolution and education of "the new man" which is already in each one of us through the man-becoming of the eternal Son of God. In proportion as the new birth of humanity grows and thrives within us we shall detect those dangerous and fertile roots of all social evil which are within ourselves; we shall grow in a godly scepticism of the braggart promises of any and every Party; and we shall look more and more for the light and grace of God in all men, women, and children, and chiefly in such as are least agreeable to us and most opposed to ourselves and our class or party prejudices. This is more than our old hearts of stone can do, and therefore on "the first day of Lent" and every day throughout it, the Church teaches us to ask the Almighty and Everlasting, who hates nothing that He has made, to create in us Churchmen new and contrite hearts.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD, THE MARTYR FOR RELIGIOUS EQUALITY †

“For I say, through the grace of God given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.”—ROM. xii. 3-5.

I SPOKE to you some years ago, in my first sermon in this church upon to-day's Epistle, of the rare and fine equity with which St. Paul does justice alike to that which we are at present calling “Individualism,” and to that which we are calling “Socialism.” These terms are merely secular or ephemeral things; they are one day in fashion and another day will be out of fashion with the press, platform, and pulpit: they mean one thing this year, another thing next year. But the truth which each term attempts imperfectly to express, in the language of the place and time, is as old and unchanging as mankind is, and will last as long as that personality and that community which have made us what we are, and upon both of which we depend to make us better than we have yet been. So inseparable are they, that whatever this or that man, this or that generation may mean by “Socialism,” our common test of its worth is

† Sunday morning, January 13, 1895.

always in a person. We ask, Will the character and condition of each individual man, woman, and child be better or worse under it?

The Apostle of Nations does not here recommend to the Roman Church the establishment of any social scheme. On the contrary, he asserts that God has already established them within a social scheme by the creation of a human kind in "one body," the Head of which one body has appeared in the Incarnation, or man-becoming of His own eternal Word and Son, Jesus Christ. Those men, women, and children who are known in Rome and elsewhere as the Church, have been called out and separated from others, and baptized by the Holy Spirit of the Father and the Son into the one universal society, to testify to every individual conscience and to all nations that men are already living in a society whose real character and organisation the selfishness of sin prevents them from seeing and comprehending. The perfect social order, so far as the Will of the Father of men is concerned, is not somewhere in the dim and distant future: it is present in us and our neighbours now, here, and everywhere. We are in need of no new social organisation here or there: but we need to see and know what the actual or godly organisation of all human society now and everywhere is. He has sent His own Son to be born, live, suffer, and die as man, He has sent His own common Spirit of grace upon each and all, in order that every individual man may be able to see and understand the perfect unity and community of the "one body" in which he is a member. The main hindrance to the perception of this constitution by any Christian in Rome, and to the harmony of his conduct with this constitution, did not lie in the bad and disordered heathen society outside him; but it lay in each Roman Churchman's own individual self, and mostly in

his individual conceit of self. "For I say, through the grace of God given unto me," that communising moral force which inwardly levels all, "to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God has dealt to every man the measure of faith." Faith is that common grace whereby alone we grasp the ultimately and eternally real and see through that which merely seems to that which really *is*. "For as we" individually "have many members in one" individual "body, and all members have not the same office": so it is in the whole social body of humanity, of the nation, of the parish, and of the family, as the Church is called out and endowed to testify to every conscience and to all peoples, "We being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."

I.

It was for the oneness and community of the whole body in Christ, especially in our England, that the great English primate, William Laud, whose martyrdom we have this week celebrated, counted not his own reputation dear unto him, in a popularity-hunting generation; thought not of himself more highly than a man ought to think, but laid down his life for God and the Common People. In every great historical person by whose acts the movement of ecclesiastical and civil society is revolutionised, as all men are agreed England was by this man's acts, we are confronted by two things—his work and his character. When the work of a great historical person is successful and permanent—as all Englishmen now see, some with gratitude and some with vexation, Laud's work was—his character is attacked by those whom his work has defeated. Where the victory pro-

mises to be lasting, as his does, the detraction is carried on from age to age. Laud was the Samson who broke down at his death the theological and social pillars of the idol-temple of Puritanism, and that inhumane erection can never be set up again.

Even the archbishop's chaplains, who revered and loved him, could not quite understand him, so high was his perception above the highest level of his own generation. They were never free, as he was, from the hereditary superstition that as "all members have not the same office," therefore they cannot be *equally* "members." It was the assumption amongst Conformists, as well as of the Nonconformist clients and chaplains of the powerful landlords and money-lords, that religious equality and community could not or should not be upheld for all estates of men in Christ's holy Church; but that the estate of nobles and gentlemen, of great landlords and rich city merchants, especially if they were patrons of Puritanism and Sabbatarianism, as they mostly were, should be allowed, in ecclesiastical and moral matters, to enjoy privileges and immunities of personal and social transgression which were denied to the low estate of the poor commons. Laud had absolutely no respect for persons in ecclesiastical or moral things. He would allow no man, because he was a lord, or a courtier, or a gentleman, or because he thought himself a "saint" and a member of "the godly Party," to transgress the one *common* law of Christ, which is binding upon man as man. Heylin seems to have thought that the archbishop could have held his place and saved his life if he had paid the same adulation to the proud, the mighty, and the rich of the land as the Nonconformist leaders did. He failed "in so many necessary civilities to the nobility and gentry," says his affectionate biographer, "by

which he might have obliged them, and indeed himself."

The archbishop was himself a man of the Common People. The fawning Puritan "trencher-chaplains" of the great landlords, and the Puritan lecturers hired and paid by the wealthy mercantile capitalists, sneered at the meanness and obscurity of his parentage. Lord Brook, one of that small group of aristocratic and gentlemanly saints whom Richard Baxter placed in heaven, upbraided Laud and the ablest of his suffragan bishops with being upstarts who had sprung *e fœce Plebis*, out of the dregs of the people. The rage of the great local landlords was unbounded when Laud's "upstart" suffragans, in their visitation articles, presumed to administer to the churchwardens and sidesmen of every local commune in their dioceses the offensive oath: "Swear that all affection, favour, hatred, hope of reward, gain, *displeasure of great men*, malice, or other sinister respect set aside, you shall deal uprightly, truly, and justly, presenting all the truth, and nothing but the truth, without partiality, having God before your eyes." "Hath any neighbouring *great man* encroached upon any part of the churchyard, inclosing it to his garden, &c. Present him or them so transgressing." "Is any maintenance given to Free and Public Schools detained, or inverted? By whom is it practised?" To put such questions to common men, as a writer complained a few months before Laud's death, while the great men held the dreaded confessor in the Tower, was a "vassaldrie to the gentry of England," who, from the time of the Tudor Liberationism, had been improprating wholesale the common property of the people in their common church, their common lands, and their common free schools. "Many *nobles* and worthy *gentlemen*," said the complainant, "are

curbed and tyrannised over by some base clergymen of mean parentage." The archbishop was not content with arresting the robberies in progress, but he compelled the robber-nobles and robber-gentry to disgorge their social plunder, wherever he could. This was especially the case with the common schools, the abolition of which was peculiarly offensive to so generous a patron and promoter of English culture as Laud was. He cited powerful landlords into the High Commission Court—that place of terror to so many mighty, proud, and rich plunderers, and place of relief to so many of the poor, humble, and oppressed—for seizing almshouses, common lands, the endowments of free schools, portions of the common churchyards, and even for "walling up the ancient ways." Those who have time and opportunity for the study, will find instances in the Calendar of State Papers and in the late publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, where they may come face to face with our martyr, and learn at first hand how it was that Laud concentrated upon his head the whole spite and vengeance of the combined force of the Landlordism and the Liberationism—the "Property and Puritanism," as his enemy Fiennes named them—of that evil generation. He loved the Common People, and was always forward to defend their religion, their recreations and sports, their social liberty, their common lands, and their free schools against the pharisaism, oppression, and embezzlement of the proud, the mighty, and the rich who had figured ever since the Reformation as the patrons of the inhumane Calvinist theology and Puritanical nonconformity and separatism. Yet he had in him nothing of the selfish demagogue, but had, as his biographer tells us, "a dislike to that popularity which was too much affected by his predecessor," Archbishop Abbot.

II.

None of our historians, not even the late Mr. Green, has as yet attempted to write the history of England from the standpoint of the Common People. Our history has been taken to be nothing better than a record of the struggles between two rival parties for political supremacy on battlefields and in parliaments. Hence every man's work has been too exclusively judged by its probable services or hindrances to the dividing Party Cause of Tory or Radical, to neither of which such a man as Laud could possibly belong, because he worked for neither, but for the Common People. The forces which in a later generation were opposed to each other as Whig and Tory, the trading power and the landed power, were united in opposition to him because he represented the unity and community of that one body in Church and Commonwealth which they were both gainsaying.

Our latest historian of the seventeenth century, Mr. Gardiner, has clearly been startled, if not staggered, at the evident contrariety between the real Laud who confronted him in the contemporary State papers and other documents, and the legendary Laud of Whig-Liberal Party tradition and Puritan superstition. He seems to me to adopt not a few curious shifts to account for the unlikeness of the Laud of history to the "Laud" of party legend. Sir William Harcourt gave full expression to the inherited and unexamined Whig legend some years ago, when he light-heartedly described him as "Archbishop Laud, whose ecclesiastical policy was only equalled by the corruption of his private manners." But Mr. Gardiner is too honest a student not to tell a great amount of the hitherto concealed or perverted truth which has confronted him; nevertheless he is too much under the bias of traditions to be

sceptical of the legends which have been masked as truth. Hence he rarely tells any truth about Laud without immediately supplementing it with a sort of apologetic commentary, or attempt to moderate the irritation which such a truth might possibly give to the prejudiced reader. Yet even Mr. Gardiner is obliged to say, whatever consternation it may produce, "The best side of Laud's character was *his grand sense of the equality of men* before the law." If so rare a thing in public men be "the best side," what excuse can be made for the political scribes and religious zealots who are so eager, age after age, that Englishmen shall see nothing but his worse side. As if all we need to know about St. Peter is that he denied the Lord thrice, and about St. Paul that he kept the clothes of those who stoned St. Stephen!

Of such a common "equality of men," either before the law of the Commonwealth or of the Church, the Puritans, both Nonconformist and Separatist, had at that time no "sense" whatever. So any one may see for himself if he will read their terrible sermons before the Lords and Commons of the Long Parliament, or if he will observe the distinction which Cromwell was careful to make in all his political speeches, between the "People in England" and the "People of God *in* England." The victorious Puritans assumed that all battles were fought, all laws passed, and all ordinances imposed, for the sake of the few whom they called the "People of God," and not for the sake of the whole Common People, the "one body in Christ." But it was this whole body of the Common Christened People, according to the faith and action of their great father-in-God, which constituted the real elect People of God, the "one body in Christ, and every one members one of another," in England as in Israel. He asserted the divine right of every member of this one body, which the Puritan disdained as the "Mixt

Multitude," to equality before the Law because of the equality which each already had through Christ, the common Head of all, before God. The Whig and Nonconformist legend is crowded with stories, true and false, of Laud's anger: but "nothing angered Laud so much," says Mr. Gardiner, "as the claim of a *great man* to escape a penalty which would fall upon others. Nothing brought him into such disfavour *with the great* as his refusal to admit that the punishment which had raised no outcry when it was meted out to the weak and helpless, should be spared in the case of the powerful and wealthy offender."

The Archbishop would not even allow the King's Court to serve as a sanctuary for offenders against the Common law of Jesus Christ. "He intended the discipline of the Church should be felt as well as spoken of," said Lord Clarendon, "and that it should be applied to the greatest and most splendid transgressors, as well as to the punishment of smaller offences and meaner transgressors." He was absolutely fearless of consequences to himself, as he was absolutely just and equal to others, and therefore he struck unflinchingly at "those who were not careful to cover their iniquities, thinking they were above the reach of other men, or the power or will to chastise. Persons of honour and great quality, in the court and in the country, were every day cited into the High Commission Court upon the fame of their incontinence or other scandal in their lives, and were there prosecuted to their shame and imprisonment."

In the notional "sins" of Nonconformity, such as dancing, Sabbath-breaking, and play-acting, his clear mind saw no transgression of the moral law; and while Richard Baxter called upon the Parliament to order poor men and women who played on Sunday to be

whipped, as well as put in the stocks, the liberal-minded archbishop simply insisted that they should join on Sunday with their neighbours in the common worship of God as well as in common play.

It was probably the first time in England that all estates of men were made to feel, in administration, and not merely in theory, that there was not one law for the rich and mighty and another law for the poor and humble. It was doubtless this, as the politic Lord Clarendon could see, which enraged the House of Lords and the House of Landlords called "Commons," jointly against him, and made them take counsel together how they should put Christ's terrible bishop to death. "The shame," says Clarendon, "which they called an insolent triumph upon their degree and quality, and a *levelling them with the Common People*, was never forgotten; but they watched for revenge." The Primate was a more true and full representative of the real "Commons" than were all or any of the members in the House of Landlords and Merchants called the House of Commons. The "democracy" of England ought to know that Laud died for the Common People. He was a martyr for Religious Equality.

It is curious now to read a newspaper report of his execution, published a few days after the martyrdom: "The Archbishop of Canterbury was this day beheaded on Tower Hill. The man did stand much upon his integrity, and at his death did justifie his innocence, expecting, I believe, some honour to be done unto him in another age, in whose almanacks he would shine in rubrick, and be canonized for some Saint, or be crowned for a martyr." ^x It was due to him, more than

^x *A Diary or an exact Journall*, faithfully communicating the most remarkable proceedings in both Houses of Parliament. No. 33, Thursday, January 16, 1645.

to any man, that the cry of the English democracy for more than a hundred years was, "Church and King." Sixteen years after his murder the common folk of Reading, whose care had always been near his heart as a local patriot, solemnly burned the Nonconformist and Scottish Covenant in Reading market-place "in memory of the precious blood of William, late Archbishop of Canterbury, spilt by this Covenant. For it was this Covenant," said they, "murdered him who was born in, and was a great benefactor to, this town of Reading." ¹

No part of that restless and beneficent activity which brought Laud to the martyr's death can be possibly understood apart from his constant determination that no man, so far as he could help, should endanger the unity and community of the one body in Christ by thinking of himself more highly than he ought to think. His sermons are full of this point, especially those preached before Parliament. There is not one of them in which community in "Church and Commonwealth" is not the main subject and the moral purpose. There was no man who thought worse of himself than he did, and it was his ready confession of his own sins which led Prynne to the malicious suggestion that he was probably guilty of unnameable wickedness. It was the delusion of all men at the time that the unity which St. Paul here says each man must realise for himself, and see in himself the nearest obstacle to it, could be outwardly established by force and restraint upon others. What the pastoral conscience of Laud perceived, and the armed enforcers of Nonconformist Covenant Uniformity could not perceive, was the necessity of exalting the Common and the Catholic

¹ *The Kingdom's Intelligencer*, No. 23, June 11, 1661.

elements of Christianity and civility, or that which is the property and the want of the whole "body" in Church and Nation, above the self-assertion and class-assertion of this or that particular "member," caste, or party. Laud allowed the most wide and liberal range to differences of opinion, as we see in his protection of the "Latitude-men," Hales and Chillingworth, as well as in his kindly dealing with every Nonconformist, who was "peaceable." We cannot conceive of him, like the members of Cromwell's Second Parliament, ordering the tongue of the gentle Quaker, James Nayler, "to be bored through with a hot iron" for what they called "blasphemy."

His passionate zeal for such good as was "Common" to all was the ground of the importance he laid upon catechising in comparison with preaching, which was then so full of opinionative individualism and quarrelsomeness. He saw that the Nonconformist clergy contributed small moral and social profit by their predestinarian sermons, which a modern man may readily understand if he will compare their contents with the contents of the last sermon preached by Dr. Hammond at St. Paul's. The fierce opposition of the Nonconformists to the weekly catechising insisted upon by Laud and his suffragan bishops was due in a great degree to the fundamental assumption of Nonconformity, that only some favoured few, the spiritual aristocracy of the so-called "godly," and not all the common folk in their parishes, whom the Father had unified, were the children of God, and the members of Christ. The Nonconformist trencher-chaplain gathered the time-serving few whom he called "the people of God" into the hall of his mighty patron, the local landlord, and there held his separate worship: and he would not give his "lecture" in the common or parish church

until the "Common Prayer" was ended. Laud refused to license these men as chaplains to the great local noblemen or gentlemen unless they would consent to take part in the "Common Prayer" of the "one body in Christ." It must be remembered that all Catholic Catechism, unlike the Nonconformist Catechism of the Long Parliament's Erastian Westminster Assembly of Divines, starts from the assumption that all the catechised are already the members of the "one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." Catholic catechising is the unfolding and applying of the doctrinal, moral, and social contents of the Common Creed, the Common Law, the Common Prayer, and the Common Sacraments of Christianity.

So when the archbishop defended the Sunday games of the common folk in every parish, and the keeping the Dedication feasts of their Common Church, against the intolerant Puritan judges and magistrates, the great point upon which he laid stress was that this neighbourly merriment was "civilising." He and his bishops were soon to be justified by the wholesale barbarism which overspread England during the Puritan reign of social terror, from whose horrible issues our nation has never yet been completely liberated. We talk much about "civilisation," but how readily we forget that it does not mean a result, but a process. Laud could not imagine, as the Nonconformists did, that God had created most of these men, women, and children for damnation in hell. His fatherly eye was quick to see that the fellowship of the children of God in common play and recreation, rich and poor together, must help each to grow up into a true *civis*, a citizen; not a mere taxpayer or ratepayer, to be cajoled by this or that party out of a vote, but an organic member with every other in the unity of the local and national Commonwealth.

Common play, like common worship, puts us upon a ground where we are high above all dividing parties, and where the pride of the individual self is disciplined by common and equalising rule.

This great father-in-God has neither wife nor children of his own, but his large heart went out to all the poor children of his province whom he conceived to be wronged. There is an instance of this in his metropolitanical visitation, amongst his injunctions and orders to the dean and chapter of Chichester. "Use some means with Mr. Peter Cox," a land-grabbing alderman of the city of Chichester, "that the piece of ground called *Campus*, now in his possession, be laid open again; that the scholars of your free school may have liberty to play there, as formerly they had. And if he shall refuse," said the archbishop, "give us notice, or our vicar-general, upon what reason and ground he does it."

Probably nothing in the canonical title of the collected religious offices of England, "The Book of Common Prayer," was more distasteful to the puritanical vicar and lecturer than the adjective "common." For it implies that those whom the Pharisee calls "the publicans and sinners" are assured of religious equality with himself in the worship of God, and that the Church rejects his division of the "one body in Christ" into the two parties of the elect and reprobate. The "worship" of God, according to the doctrine of the Nonconformists, could not properly be "common." None but the elect, the saints, the godly, or the predestinated individuals, could rightly worship God. Hence all that could properly be "common" to the godly and ungodly parties in the public religious assemblies, as they held, was the sacred privilege of "hearing." The parishioners, after the expulsion of

their bishops and the prohibition of their Common Prayer, were officially described as "hearers," and the intruded Nonconformist State incumbents merely as the "public preachers."

One of the complaints of Laud's adversary, Henry Burton, against "the Common Prayer," was "it cut short sermons." The worship that is social strikes at the individualism of the man in the pulpit; it is an apostolical reminder to him "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly." The pulpit, the symbol of individualism, was the idol which they set up in the place of the Eucharist, the symbol of social unity and community. It was held as part of the right relations of Church and State, both amongst the Nonconformists and the Separatists, that the civil magistrate ought to compel the "Mixt Multitude," as they called the "one body in Christ," to "hear" their sermons and lectures.

St. Paul demands from every one of us a severe and self-disciplinary contribution to unity. It may humble us the more to recollect that what the apostle demands from us is so frankly negative. God, the eternal Unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, into whose social name each of us is baptized, has already taken care for our unity and community by making us "one body in Christ." The individual genius can make many wonderful things, but unity it cannot make. By not thinking of myself more highly than I ought to think I do not contribute to the establishment of some novel unity, but I shall be contributing in ways which I may not see to the recognition of that everlasting and indestructible unity in which He has established us by making us members of one body. Unity is His gracious gift, already given, and we have been called into it, and we are within it; and according to our "measure of

faith" we may see that we are, because faith sees that which really *is*, and acts upon that sight. Neither will it ever be taken away: "for the gifts and calling of God," as St. Paul has just said to the Church of Rome, "are without repentance."

ST. PAUL'S POLITICAL COUNSEL TO THE ROMAN CHURCH †

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God.”—ROM. xiii. 1.

THERE is nothing more wonderful in the history of politics—in the highest sense of that term—than the political counsel of the Apostle of the Nations to the members of the Church of Rome. I do not merely refer to the significant fact that his assertion of the Divine authority of the *de facto* civil rule was expressly made to the Roman Church, nor to the equally pregnant fact that the apostle's letter to that Church omits all reference to the universal spiritual authority which the bishops of that Church now pretend has belonged to their seat, as the very highest of “the higher powers,” from the beginning of Christianity. I refer, rather, to the political conduct which the apostle declares to be binding upon every Roman Christian as such. “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.” As in the last chapter we saw that he looked upon the Churchman's individualist conceit and self-assertion as the worst of evils in the common body of the Church, so we see here that he regarded the Churchman's individualist conceit and self-assertion as the worst of evils in the common body

† February 3, 1895.

of the State. "Every soul," Jewish or Roman, is to be "subject unto the higher powers." As it was not possible for such a liberator of conscience to advise a mere blind obedience—which is the obedience of a fool and not of a free spirit—the apostle gives the Roman Church his reason for his counsel. He grounds the conduct of politics upon the theology of politics, which is the apostolic science of politics.

I.

We are all ready, the Roman Church might say, to obey the higher powers, so soon as we are reasonably assured which of the two or more powers always contending politically are the higher powers, and which the lower, so that we may refuse obedience to the lower, and gladly yield it to "the higher."

This, as you possibly know, was the argument with which the hired pen of Milton justified the tyrannical minority for its judgment and execution of the Common King of the whole People. The People, he said, are "the higher powers," the King is the lower; individually, he is but one of the People, whom his fellows, for their own convenience, have chosen to be their chief or sovereign. He is responsible to them. The higher power which has a right to choose, has a right to alter its choice, and to reject. If the People can enthrone one of their number to be their King, they can dethrone him. King Charles refused to be "subject to the higher powers," and to the People; so the higher powers, and the People, cut off his head. What Milton needed to prove was not that the whole is greater than a part, even than the chief part, but how a handful of colonels, parliament-men, great landlords, lawyers, and fanatical preachers, who were hated by the People,

could usurp to themselves any divine or human right to call themselves "the People." As a matter of fact, when the King's head was cut off, the most truly representative masses of the people, when they saw the work done by those who took their name, groaned, and shrieked, and sobbed; and the brutal coldness of the tyrannical minority beat the People for giving so clear a manifestation of the actual democratic judgment and the real popular sentence. Marchmont Needham, who was the official newsman in turn of the Rump Commonwealth, and of Cromwell its destroyer—aided, as I believe, by Milton—attempted, week after week, in a series of clever, casuistical articles, loaded with biblical references, to prove that whoever had got mastery by the sword became the "higher powers."

Under the four party-governments which followed the execution of the Common National King—the Rump Parliament's "Commonwealth," the Barebone's "Supreme Authority," Cromwell's arbitrary Cæsardom, and the Anarchy which tore the land during the interval between his death and the Restoration of the one Common King and the one Common Church—the English People could never bring themselves to believe that any of these self-exalted powers were rightly the "higher powers." Yet the people obeyed them all in turn, "subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." Nay, the men who most disliked them, and who were most barbarously silenced and persecuted by them all—as St. Paul was by the rulers whom he obeyed—were the most obedient men in England. They took no part in Royalist plots. If Bishop Hall, and Hammond, and Jeremy Taylor, and hundreds of other such blameless confessors, had been asked why they paid taxes, tributes, customs, fear, and honour, to rulers so fanatical and cruel, would they not have

answered in St. Paul's words, "There is no power but of God : the powers that be are ordained of God"? We know from Bishop Sanderson's "Cases of Conscience" how they justified their obedience.

II.

But is there not here something of a contradiction to the whole tenor of the Hebrew history? The nation to which St. Paul belonged, of which he was so proud and thankful to be a member, which had many a citizen in the Church of Rome, had risen to be a nation by a strike, a rebellion, a revolution. Were not Pharaoh and all his host "the higher powers" when the tribes were in bondage in Egypt? If Moses had said, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers," where would Israel have been? Nay, where would the Church of Jesus Christ, born out of Israel, have been? Is not the whole moral law of Israel and of the universal Church grounded upon belief and trust in the God who inspired the Hebrew slaves of Egypt to revolution? In the Catechism we teach English children to say, "I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." What then? This is the first of laws for each English boy and girl, "Thou shalt have no other gods but Me." And who is the only Lord God but He who inspired and blessed the rebellion of the slaves in Egypt?

Now, St. Paul in one of his epistles had to deal with the case not indeed of an enslaved people, but of one slave. We know that he did not urge him, as Moses had urged St. Paul's fathers in Egypt, to rebel against his master. Yet who has proved the greater liberator in the end, Moses or St. Paul? Moses liberated one nation, St. Paul has liberated many; perhaps we may even say

that the Apostle of Nations will prove to be, under Christ the King, beyond all other men, the liberator of all nations. Where, then, are we to look for the conciliation of a difference which seems on the surface to be so tremendous, as that between Moses, to whom the Jews were then in bondage, and the apostle who was sent by Christ Jesus to all peoples as a liberator? The contrast between the enslaving Jewish law of Moses and the liberating universal, humane Gospel of Jesus Christ is a contrast which runs through the whole of this epistle to the Church of Rome. St. Paul wrote it to set men free.

I return to the point from which we started, namely, that St. Paul was fighting the destructive individualist self-conceit and self-assertion which lurks in every soul (*παδα ψυχῆ*), Jew or Roman, Greek or barbarian, slave or freeman, in the one common Church. The first necessity of the one common body from each member is not the braggart self-assertion of the clever individualist soul, but the free self-repression of the individualist instinct of each soul to tyrannise, and of its instinct to refuse self-subjection. The dictatorship and demagoguery of the individual spring out of one and the same instinct. The Jews were known in Rome as a rebellious, anti-social element, full of the conceited political theories of a Judas, that a Jew was too noble a man, too exclusively one of God's own aristocracy, to pay the tribute, custom, honour, and any other supposed due to a pagan and infidel ruler; and the Church of Rome was suspected of like instincts, because it would only be known to the Roman rulers as one of the various Jewish sects. Whether the majority of souls in the fellowship of the Roman Church were Jews, or Romans, or Greeks, or barbarians, we may leave to the critics; the cursory reading of the apostle's letter will show us how thoroughly the Roman Church was permeated with Judaical

prejudices and boastings. Therefore St. Paul reminds every individual or soul amongst them at starting to think first not of what he is by his own dignity of race and birth, nor of what he is by his own insight into truth, but to think of what they all are by God's gracious act in the common baptism, to remember what the whole Church of Rome is, "the called of Christ Jesus." Next he tells them to think of what they are pledged to be morally and socially, as Christ's Roman Society, in the midst of Roman paganism and atheism, "called to be saints," holy men, women, and children. Hence he had nothing to tell them about the right judgment of this or that political theory, nor about the proper attitude of a Roman Churchman toward this or that political movement in Rome, which is the very thing that Moses had to tell the fathers about a social movement in Egypt. But the apostle, beholding the perfect social "pattern in the mount," the Eternal City, which even the universal Church, as well as every State, falls so short of reaching on earth, points "every soul" in the Church to the theological and the moral ground for right political conduct. It lies in each Christian not "thinking of himself more highly than he ought to think" in the daily life of the State, which is a civil Commonwealth, as well as in the daily life of the Church. What the Roman Churchman ought to do if "the higher powers" in Rome should command him to sacrifice to idols, or to steal, or to murder, or to commit adultery, or to bear false witness against his neighbour, or to obey man rather than God, does not once come into the question. Those who bring this to the front are too often forgetful that we ought to "obey God rather than men" in suffering, as well as in acting. But the apostle's own conduct and suffering supplied answer enough to such questions. His work is to mortify the individualist Judaism, paganism, and

atheism of the old man in the political conduct of the regenerate, so that the new man of the perfect City, Kingdom, and Commonwealth of Christ might take deeper root, live and grow in every soul. This he does, I say, by bringing before the reason and conscience of each Churchman in Rome the theological and moral ground of the whole field of politics and administration, and reminding each what God is demanding from every Churchman and from every official in the State, from the Cæsar Nero to the meanest tax-gatherer.

III.

The Jew, and probably therefore the Jewish Christian also, had a superstition that Satan had founded the Roman Empire, and that Nero was therefore reigning by the grace of the devil. This became the doctrine a thousand years later of the powerful bishop of the Roman Church, Gregory VII., who boldly asserted in his contest with the successor of Augustus and Nero for a divine title to rule every soul as the higher power, that the devil was the author and founder of the State. And even in our own generation, the founders of the Liberation Society, which they first called the Anti-State-Church Society, grounded their political policy upon the assertion that, as the State originates from the World, and the Church originates from God, therefore Cæsar and Parliament ought to be bribed or frightened into separating the Church from the World. The late Mr. John Bright was so fogged by the early superstition as to call the union of the Church and Commonwealth "adulterous," as if it were a principle of Quakerism that bishop and priest are ordained by God, but kings and prime ministers and judges ordained by the devil. To the Jews, to the Judaical Christian, to the Papist, and to

the Liberationist, the Apostle of the Nations says, as the Hebrew psalmist and prophet had indeed always said, "There is no power but of God ; the powers that be are ordained of God." In this point at least, they are like the apostles, bishops, and priests of the Church. We honour and obey the Queen, the Parliament, the local Council, the judge, and the tax-collector upon the same theological ground as we honour and obey the Bishop of London. Any Judas or Barabbas, any fool or scoundrel, can supply our individualist self-assertion, or our caste and party conceit, with hundreds of reasons and excuses for breaking away from the common body in Christ by acts of dishonour and disobedience. One of the hardest acts in life, as we may know by experience, is to honour and obey, for the common good of the whole body, such rulers in the Church and the Commonwealth as individually exhibit small claims to respect and obedience.

St. Paul passed from the theological to the moral ground for the self-subjection of every individual soul to the common authority, the State, which is the gracious and glorious ordinance of our Teacher. Hence, whether it takes the form of a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a democracy, it is everywhere and always obliged, by God's overruling, more or less to assert and vindicate the common morality, which restrains the individual, and holds the Commonwealth together in some degree of unity. The most degraded of Commonwealths could not keep itself alive, but would dismember into a formless anarchy, unless its rulers retained enough of the image of God, and of the Perfect Unseen City, to say with power to each of its subjects, "Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour, Thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbour's." "For rulers are not a terror to good

works," says the apostle, "but to the evil. Wilt thou then" (he is still speaking to the self-asserting individualist mind) "not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

St. Paul's political precepts near the end of this letter are not to be taken as detached axioms, but they are to be interpreted by the apostolic dogma of the relation of each individual to the "one body Christ," which underlies all his counsels both as Churchman and Statesman. The apostle's idea of political authority, as Maurice has said, was derived altogether from the Universal Church, and not from the Roman Empire. For no State and Commonwealth, no parish and commune, and no family, can entirely know itself—any more than a man can rightly know himself, "come to himself"—except by going to the Father. "Every soul" within the Church is to exhibit in his political conduct to emperors and rate-collectors, the ecclesiastical principle of the "one body in Christ"—that principle which is perverted and distorted, not only in the pseudo-universal body of the Roman Imperial State, but even in the best National State which the world has ever yet seen. What, then, is the Christian "soul" to do? Is he to come out of the Commonwealth, as out of a "Babylon"? Is he to separate Church and State, and confine himself and all his care within the Church, as the separated "Sion of God"? No! he is to carry out to the worst of States the godly and self-repressing principle of the Church, that there is but one body in Christ, in which all members have not the same office, and nevertheless, are every one equally members one of another.

THE DISENDOWMENT OF THE SAVIOUR †

“And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter’s field, to bury strangers in.”—ST. MATT. xxvii. 7.

JUDAS, the apostate Christian, by his contract with the rulers of his nation, had at last brought about the disestablishment and disendowment of Christ the Lord. The founder of the Church had already been disestablished—so far as secular power can disestablish Him that sitteth in the heavens—of His claims to a kingdom, a priesthood, and the prophetic and pastoral functions. He was no longer going all over the nation doing good. He was tied and bound in the malicious toils of the Jewish sects and the Jewish State authorities. He and His disciples, according to the slang of Pharisæism, were an “alien” society; they came from Galilee. The eminent religious and political leaders had even said to Him, “Thou art a Samaritan.” He and His Church were in “a minority,” they had only gathered a fragment of the people, though He pretended He had a mission from God to the whole people. Judas saw with horror his Teacher stripped and beaten, disendowed of liberty and reputation, and about to be disendowed even of life.

“Then Judas, which had betrayed Him, when he saw

† April 7, 1895.

that He was condemned, repented himself." Hence it may be gathered that Judas had not expected so horrible a disaster. He had seen the Saviour's mighty works, and heard His omnipotent words, which no conscience could resist ; and he probably thought, so far as a man who lives for the individualist selfish moment is able to think, that Jesus, either by a miracle or by His eloquence, would redeem Himself from death. But now, when the Lord's prediction of His death, which Judas and the other apostles had disregarded, was being so suddenly fulfilled, the traitor felt some remorse, "and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders," saying that he was resolved to renounce his part in the contract, and undo so far as he could what he had done, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood."

I.

The two parties to this contract, the false Christian disciple and the rulers of the Jewish people, had different ends in the sale and purchase of Jesus. The official statesmen thought only of their own immediate political triumph, or of security in their profitable places and power. There is no immorality of which the Party Achitophels are incapable. But Judas cared nothing for Party; he had been moved by selfish individualist covetousness. As the evangelists declare, he had been a preacher of Christ. He had himself worked for Christ's kingdom, and perhaps with zeal. "For," as St. Peter said, at the election of St. Matthias, "he was numbered with us." But the slow and unshowy methods of Christ's kingdom, and its apparent failure to get hold of the majority, had disappointed his own social or monetary ambitions. He had lately grumbled at a devout woman's

endowment of the Saviour with an "alabaster box of very precious ointment." He had, thereupon, given vent to the first insidious Liberationist speech in the history of Christendom. When "the house was filled with the odour of the ointment, then saith one of His disciples, Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, who should betray Him, Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor?" Why was this valuable sum thrown away upon the endowment of a minority of One Person, though He be ever so good? It might have been made to profit all Jewry by paying it to some great pharisaic contractor, who could at once provide labour for the poor and make a well-merited fortune for himself, by the constructing of baths and wash-houses, libraries, polytechnics, museums, or parks; or it might be contributed towards the purchase of the potter's field to bury foreigners in.

St. Matthew, whose business it had been to deal with money, implies that the faithful apostles also were carried away by the Liberationist and demagogic argument of Judas, and St. Mark tells us that "some" of them certainly yielded to it. It may be that the traitor was a man of strong intellectual character, and a ready debater, and that he persuaded his simple colleagues to believe that his projected disendowment of Jesus Christ would really prove a benefit to the poor, whom Jesus loved. Neither St. Matthew nor St. John, whose fellow-worker he had been, attempted any pharisaic and self-complacent contrast between him and themselves, or the other apostles. They were no puritans after Pentecost. They then and there had learned by the Holy Ghost that one and the same old Adam, one and the same carnal man which is not after God, was in them and in him, and must be mortified and crucified in them before they could rise and sit with

Christ, and be strong in His new life to do all things. We need no Scripture to tell us that the Church defender or the apologist for catholic and national Christianity, may be as bad a man as the Liberationist or the political Machiavelli, nay, perhaps a far worse man. It was the universal "infection of nature," that *φρόνημα σαρκός* "which is not subject to the law of God," which in Judas betrayed and sold the Saviour, in Herod mocked Him, in Pilate gave Him to the cross, in St. Peter denied the Saviour, and perverted all the apostles into cowards who forsook Him and fled.

Yet, notwithstanding the likeness between Judas and his colleagues, the evangelist indicates, for the Church's sake, the distinction which made him in the end a separatist from the apostolic fellowship and a conspirator with the secular rulers against Jesus. St. John lays hold of the Liberationist and demagogic argument of Judas for the endowment of the poor, in order to mark the eternal or moral difference between the separatist one and the faithful apostolic eleven. They may have accepted his argument out of their care for their poor fellow-citizens, whose hunger, misery, rights, and need of a real gospel the Lord had so often enforced upon their conscience by His word and work. They may have thought that the disendowment of Jesus for the endowment of the poor was a sort of act after His own heart.

We may compare the apostles, before they received the strength of Whitsun Day, to some weak-headed Churchman who has become so blind a slave of party as to confuse and confound a majority triumph of his own political faction with the triumph of the Kingdom of Christ; and so persuades himself that he can serve both God and Mammon, Christ's Church

and His own Party, by casuistically arguing that Parliament may endow Christ's clergy with spirituality by disendowing them of their daily bread, and giving it to the rich or pushing contractors whom he speciously calls "the poor."

But every man with an historical mind—that is, who takes heed to the infallible Word of God, in all the past disendowments of Christ's spikenard—see that the profits of such disendowment have nearly always hitherto gone to the rich, the mighty, and the proud, and rarely, if ever, brought any help to the poor, humble, and meek. It was so with the Liberationist Popes of the Middle Ages, who disendowed the poor parish priests and local churches of their tithes, and endowed the rich and powerful monastic corporations with them. It was so with the Liberationist Tudor monarchs, who endowed the great landlords, the Russells and Leicesters, with the ecclesiastical funds which were seized under the pretence of promoting higher education. It was so with that den of Liberationist robbers, the Long Parliament, whose members seized the episcopal lands and cathedral lands under pretence of spending them upon the service of "the Commonwealth," but voted them to one another and to the payment of the arrears of the covetous Ironside soldiery. The very same arguments which the Judas of to-day cites for the disendowment of the common Church, the Judas of yesterday used for the disendowment of the common lands, and the poor are likely to reap as small profit, and the rich and pushing as great profit, out of the present ecclesiastical disendowment, as out of the earlier secular disendowment. They talk mostly of disendowing "a rich Church," as if the Welsh Church were one single individual, like a Vanderbilt or a Rothschild. They might as reasonably lay hands upon all the

wages of all the poor wage-workers in the nation, and then say that they were merely disendowing "a rich class." They are really disendowing the poor parish priests; they are indirectly robbing the poor communes. And if the parties which divide and rend the Commonwealth had not been too selfish and cowardly to allow the parishes to elect their clergy we might add that they are directly disendowing poor parishes. There are already quarrels within the den over the distribution of the plunder, to settle how much of it shall be left to each parish, and how much go to "Wales" at large.

St. John tells the Church that Judas was under no such illusions as those wherewith his honest colleagues were beguiled. He did not really desire that the poor should be endowed by his Bill for the disendowment of the Redeemer of the poor. "This he said," as the Apostle of Charity tells the Church, "not that he cared for the poor," as the great publican Zaccheus had cared, "but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein." It was of his own endowment that the scoundrel was thinking when he made his famous Liberationist and demagogic speech. It was from the apostolic fellowship of Christ, and covenanted for his own endowment that he separated himself with the faction which then ruled the State, and which saw the value at that crisis of the services which he, as a preacher of Christ, could render their party. He lost his share of what was put into the bag of Christ and His apostles; but he got his "thirty pieces of silver, the price of Him that was valued" by the Jewish political council. So, too, it was of their own establishment that the political caucus was thinking when it made its contract with Judas. St. Matthew accuses the people as well as the Government.

“Whom they of the children of Israel did value,” that is, by their majority vote (on the side of the Pharisee and Sadducee faction) “Crucify Him! Crucify Him!” It was the act of the whole people, by their votes, as the Prophet and Evangelist say: they could not shuffle it off upon Judas, nor upon the Government.

II.

The text reminds the Church that the policy suggested by Judas, in his Liberationist and demagogic speech, was ultimately established by the Act of the Government. I will not attempt to deal with the apparent discrepancies between St. Matthew's account in the gospel, and St. Peter's account to his fellows at the election of St. Matthias into the great bishopric vacated by Judas. Nor could it be of any moral use to spend time over the much-debated citation from the national prophets. When the apostate Christian knew the whole ghastly issue of his contract with the Government, and wanted the rulers to relieve him of his part by taking back the bribe, they derided him. “And they said, What is that to us? See thou to that.” The Act has passed our Parliament and has received the imperial sanction. “True progeny of Cain,” exclaimed Grotius, “they speak the language of Cain.” They refused to discuss the question. Whether Jesus in Himself were innocent or guilty was no concern of theirs. They were practical politicians, and they wanted votes and influence against Him because they knew Him only as a pseudo-Christ, and a danger to the Government, and an obstacle to what they pleased to call “the religion of the majority of the nation.” So Judas, “rushing out of their presence, cast down the

pieces of silver in the temple, and departed and went and hanged himself."

The Government of the Jewish people, St. Matthew tells the Church, hereupon held a privy council, and discussed how they should dispose of the price of the Saviour's blood, the thirty pieces of silver which the despairing Judas had flung down in the temple. It had thus been turned into an offering to God, an endowment to be thenceforward employed, as Dionysius the Carthusian says, "in the maintenance and repairing of the temple of God, and in the sustentation of the ministers of the temple." The rulers collected, by their servants, the money of Judas, now become the money of God, the price of Jesus' blood. They accepted the thirty pieces of silver which they had hitherto refused. What should be done with this fund? "And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury aliens in." Hence it is that St. Peter, in his address to the disciples, said with justifiable irony that Judas was the moral purchaser. "Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity," "the wages of unrighteousness." St. Peter said that "it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem": and the apostle, or else the historian of the Church, added, "insomuch as that field is called in their proper tongue *Aceldama*, or the field of blood," as St. Matthew also says. *Aceldama* would be an appropriate title for a museum or polytechnic in a rich town, bought with the impoverishment of Christ's poor priests, or with the disendowment of some poor parish whose inhabitants may never set foot in the museum.

We have time only to glance at the puritanical casuistry of the State purchasers. The money, said the Nonconformist conscience, is the price of blood; and yet as this endowment has been actually given to

God, as it has been offered in His temple, it ought to be employed according to the original wishes of the donor. It should be spent on something useful to the community. The like has been said of most endowments which have in various ages been obtained by the impoverishment or starvation of Christ's poor parish priests, or by depriving parishes of their common and settled pastors. "It is not lawful to put them in the treasury," said the rulers, "because it is the price of blood." The powerful disendowers could not with any show of piety, policy, or decency, directly and openly use such a fund for the endowment of the disendowing parties. The Tudor Liberationists would have expended it without misgiving upon their race-horses, which are more costly than parish priests. But the pharisaic conscience would now be appalled at so scandalous an abuse; nor would the modern farmer be pacified by the transference of his tithe from the support of the common worship of the Father in the parish church to the service of the devil of gambling at Epsom or Newmarket. The Jewish parliament decreed that it should be used for some purpose, as Luke of Bruges puts it, which could be represented to the public as pious and necessary. "*Simulando pietatem,*" said Ludolf the Saxon five hundred years ago, "*intendendo iniquitatem.*" These Jewish parliament-men affected to be doing acts of piety, but they intended an act of unrighteousness. So they endowed the potter, or the ground landlord of the potter's field, whose soil was too exhausted to yield any further trade profits, with the price of the Saviour's disendowment. It may remind us, in this city parish, of those "great bargains in bishops' lands" and in cathedral lands, and in the stones and scaffoldings of St. Paul's, and the fund collected by Archbishop Laud for the restoration of our

Mother Church, which were contracted between the Long Parliament and the wealthy Nonconformist aldermen of London.

We have heard and read enough of late about the true "religiousness" of disendowing Christ's parish clergy and endowing museums and polytechnics, with light-hearted perversion, either serious or comical, of the example of St. Ambrose. From the parliamentary and newspaper casuistry of our age we can understand all the arguments which were used in the first age of the Church by this council of the Jewish rulers. Everything that could have been said by Pharisee or Sadducee in that Council which condemned the Saviour of the world His Passion and Cross has been said in the great Council of our own nation, or written by the servile Scribes of the party newspapers.

I cannot tell you how clearly I see, nor how keenly I feel, that we have no right to condemn the Judas outside us, unless we are fighting against the Judas within us. Therefore I remind you again, as I try to keep myself in mind, that the Judas nature is that old Adam common to us all, and in us all. It is that fallen humanity in men by which Jesus is always, everywhere, and by all undervalued, rejected, disendowed, and crucified, whether in Himself or in the person of the least of His brethren, the hungry, the thirsty, the alien, the naked, the sick, the prisoner. We have no right to imitate the wrath of the Lamb against the sons of iniquity and delusion unless we are willing to imitate His meekness, humanity, and readiness for the cross, and to believe that there is another, better, and more abiding sonship in them. It is as true of the blind zealots of every generation, as He said it was of the zealots who disestablished and disendowed Him, "They know not what they do." As He came forth from the grave on Easter

Day with absolution, love, and help for those who had brought Him to the cross, so may His bishops and priests in Wales, if Satan should get his blind and short triumph over them, come forth with a new Easter and a new Pentecost for the whole Welsh people.

MY DUTY TOWARDS MY NEIGHBOUR †

“Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord. Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged. Look unto Abraham your father, and to Sarah that bare you : for I called him alone, and blessed him, and increased him. For the Lord shall comfort Zion : He will comfort all her waste places, and He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord : Joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving, and the voice of melody.”—ISA. li. 1-3.

THE whole of this chapter is a sermon by a patriotic citizen upon the reform of a city, and I think that the text will be more suggestive than anything which I can say about it. “Ye that follow after righteousness” is a fair apostrophe, not only to those who cry for the reform of London, but also to many who abstain from joining in that cry lest they should involve themselves in the bondage and unrighteousness of Party, but who are nevertheless busy at work, each in his place, for the reformation of our city.

I.

The committee of contraries which has named this day “Citizen Sunday” sent me a post-card, and courteously invited me to give the title of some “subject” upon which I would preach. I hurriedly wrote down

† Sunday, October 27 (“Citizen Sunday”).

the simple question of the old English national Catechism, "What is thy duty towards thy neighbour?" I see that it is not included in the list which they have issued, so that I am quite free to detach myself from any show of partisanship, and attach myself the closer to the great reforming society which the Lord has established in our Sion, and in every single parish that composes its unity. That reforming society which is called by the Apostle of Nations, the patron saint of London, the mother of us all, has laid hold of every young Londoner whom she could reach, and has solemnly asked him or her, "What is thy duty towards thy neighbour?"

The first thing which must strike every thoughtful observer, when he sees the Church Catechism and London Reform put side by side, is that not a few of those who are now most forward in agitating about London Reform are not less prominent in the agitation against "Creeds and Catechisms." It is not a question whether the Catechism ought to be taught as a part of the common secular schooling—where I should have no quarrel with them—but it is rather their question how as few English children as possible may be kept from learning the English Church's Catechism. They would probably think it a glorious London Reform to burn all the Catechism except the Fourth Commandment, and to have the municipal powers interpret the Fourth Commandment upon Separatist principles, by shutting up all public-houses, keeping all museums and picture galleries shut, and in course of time giving some civic encouragement to revivalist meetings and the promotion of Separatism.

Yet can anything be more peculiarly "civic" or "municipal" than to ask the future citizen what is due from him to his neighbour? Can any words contain a

more hopeful germ of reform for our Sion, than the answer which the Church demands from every boy or girl whom she asks, "What is thy duty towards thy neighbour?" I will not now read that answer. I hope you all know it. If you know it, and have the spirit of a reformer in you, you must wish that every child in London could be brought up at the knees of the Church. The children give that answer, as you know, in their double character, as being children at the same time of the English National Commonwealth, and of the worldwide fellowship of Christ's Catholic Church. The answer seems to me to contain a noble abstract of "civic" duties, at all events of the inward neighbourly soul and spirit of them.

Civic schooling, or instruction in the outward duties and rights of the future parishioner and citizen, as I often regret, has not yet become a recognised part of our English common schooling, as it now is in some other national commonwealths. It would be a step to the reform of our citizenship if we English folk had for all our children, as members of the local and the national commonwealth, such a Catechism, as we already have for those of them who have by Holy Baptism been made members of the Universal Church. It is the humane faith of the Church that every child born into the world has received, through the man-becoming of God's only-begotten Son, an election and title to be made a member of the Church. Has not each child received by birth a like "civic" election and title, and that also from God, to be the member of a commonwealth, local and national? London is a huge collation of parishes, and every child born in London belongs to one of them, and has "civic" rights and duties as a parishioner, whereof he may live and die profoundly ignorant.

II.

But let us get rid of such foreign and platform words as "civic," "municipal," "parochial," and the like, and find some true English names for these qualities. To use such words without interpreting them, as the Common Prayer Book of England says of the ancient services of the English Church, is to "read in Latin to the People, which they understand not." And the "civic" schooling of English children should surely first of all be English—popular, common, in "the vulgar tongue." We should in our speech on these matters, as the reforming prophet of Sion said to his fellow-citizens, "Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn." The nations and parishes learn from the Universal Church what a nation is, and what a commune is, as each child learns from her what a man rightly is. Hence, as an English priest, I may be expected to say that the best English word for "citizen" is that word which the Church has adopted, the word in which she has discerned the very soul and spirit of citizenship, the word "neighbour"—which means the one who is outwardly *next* or *nearest* to us. There are still some old Teutonic communes where the technical and legal name for the parish is *Nachbarschaft*, that is to say, "neighbourhood" or "neighbourship." Our neighbour's lodging, whether a hut or a villa, touches ours; his personal and family life has been so ordered by the will of the Fatherly Providence as to bring him and his into one and the same common parish with us and ours. Whenever you and I get outside the sacred circle of our family, we find that we are still closed around with the walls of another circle, which is also of godly origin and building; it is that of the neighbourhood, the parish, the city, or the congregation of unlike social elements, which the Eternal Pastor, by so many strange acts in history

and in His discipline over families and souls, has compacted together into one body. A parish is no mere club: it is no mere Separatist meeting. We do not choose our neighbours: wherever we go we find them already chosen for us by God. They are such as the Father Himself has elected to be our fellows.

The Catholic Church has never omitted, in any age or nation, to bear witness to this primary principle of all wholesome "civic" reform, and so of all right "London reform," by what is often called "her parochial system." In one of the earliest records of London Separatism, which the Dissenting historians quote with admiration, we are told how a group of Londoners who imagined themselves to be too holy or too scripturally enlightened to join the common worship with their neighbours, were brought before the Lord Mayor and the Bishop of London. It was on June 20, 1567, "in great Eliza's golden prime," when Churchmen and Separatists alike imagined it was the fuction of the State to act as a dictator in religion. To all those who resented such a claim, even though they did it in the interest of the foreign Roman bishop or in the interest of a nation-dividing Sect, we owe a great degree of honour and gratitude. This company of Elizabethan Londoners, under the pretence of keeping a wedding feast, had hired Plumbers' Hall, and there they set up a Separatist meeting, so that they might privately enjoy "the sacramentes administered," as they said, "without idolatrous geare." Their great complaint was that the continuity of the Church in the parishes of London had not been broken, by the arm of the State, when Queen Elizabeth succeeded Queen Mary, but that parish priests who had ministered in London under Bishop Bonner, were still allowed to minister to the same parishes by virtue of the same ordination, under Bishop Grindal.

Although that prelate had contracted during his exile a strong sympathy with Puritan Nonconformity, he had no sympathy with Puritan Separatism, which seemed to him to strike at the very root of the godly union of Christianity and neighbourhood, or of the Church and the Commonwealth. He corrected them for their casuistical pretence to the sheriff that they wanted the hall for a wedding, when they really wanted it for a Separatist religious meeting. "We did it," said they, "to save the 'woman harmless.'" "Yea," said the kindly bishop, "but ye must not lie: that is against the admonition of the apostle, 'Let every man speak the truth to his *neighbour*.'" The very point of divergence between the Church and a Sect was rightly put by the Father in God of the Londoners, whatever other mistakes he may have made, when he said to them, "Ye have showed yourselves disorderlie in absenting yourselves from your Parische Churches, and the assemblies of other Christians in this Commonwealth." Nixon, one of the Separatists, seems to have shared the Sabbatarian belief of some of our modern Separatists who are forward in London reform. It ought never to be forgotten by any English citizen that the English bishops were denounced for a whole century by the Puritans as the foremost patrons of the Sabbath-breaking of the common people, as I hope some of the preachers on "Museum Sunday" may tell their hearers. "You can suffer bear-bayting, and bowling, and other games to be used on the Sabbath day," said the Separatist to the Bishop of London, "and on your holy days." It was not the suffering of the bears, as even Macaulay could confess, but the neighbourly games on Sunday which made the Puritans angry. And it would have been within the bishop's office to reply, that the Sunday games which unite the neighbours of a common parish, so that "joy and gladness shall be found

therein," may be more "civilising," neighbourly, and Christian than the Separatist meetings which break in pieces the unity which God established by making them all neighbours one of another, and break it under the superstition that a schism is a peculiarly acceptable service to the common Father of all.

III.

It is not historically correct, however, to call the parochial system "the Church's parochial system," still less to describe it as an Anglican peculiarity. The Church was not sent into the nations to create new systems; her proper work, as her Sender said, is to "bear witness." The parish is no crafty invention of apostles, bishops, priests, or Christian statesmen: but that which is often called "the Church's parochial system," in contradistinction to the Separatist system of "gathered Churches," is simply the Church's pious and believing recognition and acceptation of God's own social and civil work in the parishes which He has made, the existing local communes. The Catholic Church is obliged to be parochial on the same grounds as she is obliged to be national. The Father had already established a complete godly and humane order in the earth before He sent His Church into the earth. The Universal Church finds this neighbourly or civic order of the Universal Father everywhere extant in more or less completeness, first in the half-civilised tribe, and then in the civilised commune. To this order, Christ's Universal Society is as bound to be conformable as the Son Himself was bound to do the Father's will. The Catholic Church has in all ages and nations confessed that it is no function of her bishops and priests to set up some new system of their own as a "Sion," and to call men to *separate* from the

Father's established system of organic neighbourhood and community, under the pretence that it is "Babylon." On the contrary, she everywhere and always is bound to christen, catechise, confirm, communicate, bless marriages, visit the sick, bury the dead, and do all other churchly works, in a religious conformity to that Divine Kingdom which was established in the earth before she was, which can never be moved, and to whose character and relations she is to bear witness.

Hence you will forgive me if I say once more, what you may think I say too often, that the most important and desirable of all London reforms, from our ecclesiastical point of view—the one reform without which every other local reform will prove lame and soulless—is that every organic neighbourhood or commune in our Sion should have freedom, duty, and self-government in its ecclesiastical as well as its secular life. Sooner or later the bishops of England, like the apostles in the ancient Sion, will find themselves obliged to call upon the people of Christ to make use of the spiritual gifts of discernment and familiarity with which the Holy Ghost has endowed them for the service of their neighbours, and to choose the men whom the successors of the apostles may ordain or refuse to ordain, institute or refuse to institute, to the ministry of each communal Church. The Church of the old Sion, when the apostles threw upon the whole multitude of the christened the obligation of choice, chose such fit men for the deacons that the apostles laid their hands upon every one of them.

Wheresoever the Church is endowed with secular property, there the secular ruler has an undoubted title to interfere in the disposition of that which the civil arm, the civil laws, the civil police have alone defended and continue to defend from spoliation and sacrilege.

If there were no organised Commonwealth, no State, there would be no Church property, or only so much as the Church members could keep from robbers by their own physical force.

Our civil rulers had a happy opportunity, at the passing of the recent Parish Councils Act, to come to the help of the local Christian people in this most necessary point of reform. But the party which was then in power let the occasion slip, it may be through partisan illiberality, or through defect of neighbourly patriotism, or through a cowardly fear of offending the Separatists and losing their votes. So instead of a whole and generous parochial reform, embracing the spiritual as well as the secular aspect of neighbourhood, we got nothing better than that lame, blind, and decrepit Parish Councils Act, by which they blunderingly attempted locally to tear asunder the universal Christian society from the civil society. Surely we ought to demand for our neighbours, as citizens of the world-wide Christian society, the Catholic Church, the same fulness of duty and right as we demand for them as members of the civil commonwealth. The prophet of Sion shows us in every line of his prophecy the ungodliness and the inhumanity of a separation of Church and State. It was a dark conception which first arose in the minds of those who held that a "true Church" could only be erected on the inhuman Calvinist conception that the Father had damned the majority of men and women in every parish before He had created them, and never intended such reprobates to be the members of a "Church." What reason can we give—except the vested interests of caste and mammon, or the jealousies of Samaria—why a neighbour should be "civilised" in things secular, but continue under barbarism, or at least under feudalism, in things ecclesiastical?

IV.

It is no enviable task faithfully to declare what is at present the one great obstacle to a full civil and secular London reform. "Fear ye not the reproach of men," says our prophet, "neither be ye afraid of their revilings." I do not think there can be a shorter or surer way to bring upon ourselves a deluge of reproach and revilings from all the time-servers, the fashionable scribes of this present evil world, than to assert that our *schism* is the great stumbling-block in the way of the reform of our Sion. We have thousands of soldiers ; but they are no organic army, because so many a one is fighting for his own hand, or for his own victory, or for the arbitrary rule of his own set, or for the victory of his schism over the community.

I mean by schism every self-separation and class-separation, civilly and ecclesiastically, from the common "rock whence we are hewn, from Abraham our father, and Sarah that bare us." The Father has made us all neighbours. He has jointed every one of us into a neighbourhood. But we have turned out of His way, and have built up a number of social schisms, one or other of which we look upon as our "Sion." There is the schism of the West from the East, or, as our fathers called it, the schism of "the town" from "the city" : there is the schism of the rich few from the many poor, the schism of the nobles from the commoners, the schism of the Pharisees from the publicans and sinners, the schism of the employers from the workers, the schism of the cultured from the ignorant.

God forbid that I should say on which side blame lies ; -for in all schisms, as we learn from the Word of God in history, both sides need confession and absolution.

The business of the Church is to uphold the simple witness in the face of all, that "there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" for every neighbourhood. But side by side with the Father's establishment of neighbourhood, and over against the Son's social and sacramental witness to neighbourhood, we are confronted with the worldly and carnal establishments of a social Phariseism, a social Separatism, a social Sadduceism, a social Mammonism, whose members are saying to the common man of the divine neighbourhood, as our prophet puts it, "Stand by thyself—come not near to me, for I am holier—I am richer, I am nobler, I am more cultured, I am more truly converted, I am more progressive, more conservative—than thou."

But when we look unto the common rock "whence we are hewn" in divers shapes, when we all look back together unto Abraham our father, we come to the solid foundation of brotherhood, sisterhood, equality, and community, out of which citizenship, or the organic estate of neighbourhood has not only been evolved, but to which it must also return if it is to know its laws. He who was more than a prophet said to the pious Pharisaic segregation which despised the irreligious, and to the critical Sadducaic segregation which despised the unlearned, "Think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham as our father : for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." And the Divine Reformer Himself said to the Sabbatarian ruler of the synagogue, whom He had offended by breaking their Sabbath, "Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound for these eighteen years, be loosed from that bond on the Sabbath day?"

Nevertheless, amongst all our dividing segregations—

whether religious, social, or intellectual—we know that there are hundreds who have a burning zeal for righteousness and concord. They have a unity of the spirit: they are sick of discord: God's law is in their hearts: they long to see the neighbours gathered together with them in one body, each caring for the good of all. But it is hard for us to conceive of any temple of the Lord in which no place is found for our own private idols, our own class chapels. God forbid that we should forget what the prophets show us, that the Priests and Levites in His temple may be the worst idolaters. Yet my idolatry cannot be an excuse for my neighbour's separation from the organic neighbourhood, established by the common Father of all for all. Whether the separation be civic or ecclesiastical, it is either an implicit denial that God has established any such neighbourhood, or else it is a doubt whether the actual neighbourhood in which we find ourselves and our neighbours is a building of His foundation. Some neighbours nickname the Church of London, or the Church of the parish to which they belong, a "sect" or a "denomination," as if the difference between it and their various segregations from it lay in mere changeable opinion: whereas it lies in the unalterable natures of the Church and of a Sect. Even the splendid code of citizenship in the Common Catechism, "My duty towards my neighbour," is nicknamed "sectarian"; and you know how often the last sentence of it is ignorantly misquoted, or mischievously perverted, as an excuse for abusing the whole of it. In the age when that code was compiled it was said that there were "three States (or estates) of life in England," that of the governor, that of the commoner, and that of the clergy. The prince as well as the labourer has to learn the Catechism of the Common Church, and the child says that whether God

shall call him to become a legislator, a common citizen, or a priest, he must do his duty in that estate of life.

A London child is not baptized or made a member of the Catholic Church because his parents are members of it, as the old Puritanism contended, but he is baptized because he is *born*; he is made a Church man, and is catechised as one, because God has already chosen him to it by making him a *man*. "Look unto Abraham your father," cries the prophet to the citizens. The father of all that are born among you, the father of all your neighbours, the father of the national commonwealth, is the father also of the faithful, the father of the Church. Look away from the Parties which divide you, look to the organic community in which they and you are one body. You cannot by any wit or policy of yours separate the Church from the State, so inextricably has God bound them together. Baptism is His testimony to their union. Neither is any christened London citizen a member of his parish church, the common church of his neighbourhood, nor has he his title to Holy Communion at its altar, because he likes it better than other churches, or because he chooses it—no, but it is because the Father of all has chosen him for it, because the best and highest Will has made him a "neighbour," and that not only of those who kneel at his side, but of the generations of Londoners who have knelt here before him, whom it is our duty as neighbours to remember before God in the representation of the one perfect, full, and sufficient Sacrifice once offered for the sins of the whole world.

Post 8vo, wrapper, price 6d.

THE PLACE OF THE BIBLE IN SECULAR EDUCATION.

**An Open Letter to the Teachers under
the London School Board.**

By **STEWART D. HEADLAM.**

New Age.—"We do most strongly welcome this 'Open Letter.' We hope it will be widely read, and we see in its main suggestions a way out of much distracting controversy."

Daily Chronicle.—"We trust that many more besides those to whom this letter is addressed will read it attentively."

THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER writes:—"I have read it with keen interest . . . there is very much of it with which I agree."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,
47, Great Russell Street, and 78, New Bond Street.

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, with Portrait, price 3s. 6d.

THE DISCIPLINE OF FAITH.

Sermons and Addresses.

By **Rev. DARWELL STONE, M.A.**

Pusey Librarian.

Friend.—"Much spiritual nourishment can be gained from these short addresses. They are written in a very reverent and devoted spirit and we breathe a truly divine atmosphere."

Church Family Magazine.—"Marked by sound scholarship, incisive style, and a reverent regard for all that constitutes the faith once delivered to the Saints."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,
47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, price 5s.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS

A Series of Sermons on Critical Questions delivered at
St. Mark's, Marylebone Road, W.

With Preface by

Rev. JAMES ADDERLEY,
and a Bibliography by each Preacher.

CONTENTS :

How to Read the Old Testament.

By Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.

The Trustworthiness of the Gospel Narrative.

By Rev. H. B. SWETE, D.D.

**The Authority and Authorship of the
Book of the Acts of the Apostles.**

By Rev. R. J. KNOWLING, D.D.

St. Paul.

By Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, M.A.

The Virgin Birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

By Rev. W. SANDAY, D.D.

The Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

By Rev. A. ROBERTSON, D.D.

Expository Times.—"The most timely and the most trustworthy of all the recent volumes of theological and critical lectures."

Guardian.—"Decidedly sound and useful."

Church Times.—"We know of no single volume which we would prefer to put into the hands of students of critical problems."

British Weekly.—"The names of the scholars whose lectures compose this volume are a guarantee that the subjects discussed will be treated with openness of mind and sobriety of judgment."

Spectator.—"We have seldom seen a more interesting study of its kind."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,
47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.

In crown 8vo, cloth, gilt lettered, with Portrait, price 3s. 6d.

FOLLOWING ON TO KNOW THE LORD.

Sermons preached in the Church of St. John the
Evangelist, Westminster,

By **BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.**

Archdeacon of Westminster, Chaplain to the Speaker, Rector of
St. John the Evangelist, Westminster, Select Preacher
before the University of Oxford.

CONTENTS :

What think ye of the Christ ?	Sexagesima.
Possessing a Faith, or Possessed by a Faith.	Quinquagesima.
The Holy Trinity.	All Saints.
The Holy Ghost.	All Souls.
Epiphany.	Holy Angels.
No Monopoly in the Christ.	Your Adversary the Devil.
Septuagesima.	Balaam's Ass.
	The Lower Animals.

Christian Commonwealth.—"A book of great sermons, there is not an obscure sentence in the whole of this supremely attractive and valuable volume."

Academy.—"Brief, masterly sermons."

Glasgow Herald.—"Food for thought in an attractive form."

Manchester Guardian.—"Show a good deal of inherited eloquence, and a sympathy with broad and progressive views."

Daily News.—"The book ought to be read by all preachers."

Light.—"We are abundantly thankful that Westminster Abbey and his own church get the benefit of such teachings and inspiration."

Oxford Chronicle.—"A rarely helpful and suggestive work."

Southampton Times.—"Very helpful to the Christian who thinks about his religion."

New Age.—"He is a profound and original thinker who keeps himself abreast of the latest teachings of science and the newest developments of philosophy."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,

47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, with Portrait, price 3s. 6d.

THE CARDINAL VIRTUES

And Other Sermons.

BY THE

Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.

Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

Christian Commonwealth.—"The volume abounds in such thrilling appeals and trenchant arguments, and these sermons will take their place amongst the homilies which will live."

Church Bells.—"They are marked with the usual earnestness and spirituality of this preacher."

Athenæum.—"Many of these sermons show considerable insight into human nature, and are well calculated to arouse the attention of the hurrying business world."

Publishers' Circular.—"Sincere, broad-minded, and illuminating."

Guardian.—"We may well be thankful that such bracing sermons as these are still being preached from the pulpit in which Liddon once stood."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,

47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.

Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, price 3s. 6d. net.

THE PSALMS OF ISRAEL.

A Course of Lectures delivered in St. Patrick's Cathedral, 1903.

CONTENTS :—

The Psalter in the Temple Worship.

Rev. H. J. LAWLOR, D.D.

The Growth of the Psalter.

Rev. J. H. KENNEDY, D.D.

The Eschatology of the Psalms.

Rev. L. A. POOLER, B.D.

The Doctrine of a Future Life in the Psalter.

Rev. N. J. D. WHITE, B.D.

The Messianic Psalms.

Rev. N. J. D. WHITE, B.D.

The Imprecatory Psalms.

Right Rev. GEO. ALEX. CHADWICK, D.D.,
Bishop of Derry.

The Penitential Psalms.

Very Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Dean of
St. Patrick's.

The Psalter in the Public Worship of the Church.

Rev. H. J. LAWLOR, D.D.

The Psalms in Christian History.

Very Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D.

Pall Mall.—"They are full of expository beauty and charm."

Cambridge Chronicle.—"This volume should be in the hands of all students."

Derry Standard.—"This book is sure to have a wide circulation."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,
47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.

SIXTH EDITION.

In crown 8vo, cloth gilt, price 6s.

TEN YEARS IN A PORTSMOUTH SLUM.

By FATHER DOLLING.

Late Priest in Charge of St. Agatha's, Landport (Winchester
College Mission).

With Portrait and Eighteen Full-page Illustrations.

Church Times.—"It is the record of a work very remarkable in all its aspects, written with all modesty ; and we think that to not a few weary workers among the sinful and degraded it may bring fresh lessons of courage and hopefulness."

Guardian.—"Will be read with the greatest interest by all who desire to learn the secret of Mr. Dolling's wonderful success in a most difficult task."

Times.—"A vivid and breezy account, from Mr. Dolling's own unconventional pen, of the singularly successful work done by him in connexion with the Winchester College Mission, in the regeneration of the district of St. Agatha's, Landport."

Pall Mall Gazette.—"Simply it is the record of ten years' stupendous work, performed by Mr. Dolling among the poor of the difficult district of Portsmouth known as Landport ; and, moreover, it is a record most modestly — even pathetically modestly—presented ; a record that is convincing in its bare truth, and in every line of it beyond expression interesting. He has given lay readers a picture of such work that they should, in all humility, most carefully study. It is not too much to say that the book is absorbingly full of incentives to thought ; for every page reveals something wonderful in the way of resource, self-restraint, and accomplishment, and not only on Mr. Dolling's part, but on the part of those connected with him at St. Agatha's."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,
47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, with Portrait, price 3s. 6d.

THE TOUCH OF GOD.

BY THE LATE

Rev. HUGH MACMILLAN, D.D.

Author of "Bible Teachings in Nature."

CONTENTS.—The Touch of God—In the Cool of the Day—The Right Treatment of Idols—Jacob and the Three Hebrew Witnesses—Bochim—The Fear of Evil—The Chain of Nature and Providence—God's Winnowing—The Blamelessness of Ignorance—A Significant Purchase—Personality and Impersonality.

Daily News: "A volume of Nature sermons prepared for publication before the death of the author, and revised by his son. Interesting and instructive, with many admirable biological illustrations and allusions."

Dundee Advertiser.—"These eleven discourses are in the gifted preacher's ripest manner, and it is good to find them included in the 'World's Pulpit Series.' A fine portrait of Dr. Macmillan adds to the pensive interest of the volume."

Record.—"Scholarly, devout, and practical."

Scotsman.—"The book will prove welcome to many, both for its substantial value as popular divinity and as a memorial of its author."

Publishers' Circular.—"The last work of the cultured, refined and eloquent preacher, who has been so faithful in the use of his talents."

Guardian.—"Here Dr. Macmillan was at his best on various moral and spiritual topics."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,

47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.

THE WORLD'S PULPIT SERIES.

Crown 8vo, handsomely printed and bound in cloth, gilt, with portraits. Price 3s. 6d. each.

TRUE RELIGION.

By the Very Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D.

Dean of Canterbury.

The Spectator.—"Dean Farrar gives us here a very noble and inspiring volume. . . . He uses plain speech on many questions which touch the public and private life of England."

The Christian.—"Fresh and original. The way of Salvation and the provision for progress in the Christian life are pointed out so that the simplest may understand and the most timid may be encouraged to step forward."

Family Churchman.—"It has the value of being a guide, to those who read it, to a higher and more spiritual worship."

THE GLORY OF LIFE.

By Rev. J. MONRO GIBSON, M.A., D.D.

Evangelical Magazine.—"Finely suggestive illustrations light up this book. From end to end the pages are alive. Clean vision, hopeful outlook, and strong, fair-minded facing of facts are the characteristics of this volume."

Church Times.—"Fresh, vigorous discourses."

Church Family Newspaper.—"Sermons and addresses, in which the great Nonconformist preacher is seen at his best."

OLD AND NEW.

By Rev. CANON SCOTT HOLLAND.

Guardian.—"Canon Scott Holland's immense enthusiasm and invincible hope."

Publishers' Circular.—"Earnest, thoughtful. . . . Sound religious teaching, great scholarly treatment."

British Weekly.—"All the sermons are alive and energetic, and all of them bear the unmistakable mark of deep conviction and sincerity."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,

47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.

freshly conceived
for nat. religion
27/10/01
chief note given
complete

THE WORLD'S PULPIT SERIES.

Crown 8vo, handsomely printed and bound in cloth, gilt, with portraits. Price 3s. 6d. each.

Publishers' Circular.—"The World's Pulpit Series,' which promises, if merit goes for anything, to have a great success."

A NEW EARTH.

SERMONS, ADDRESSES AND LECTURES.

By Rev. JAMES ADDERLEY, M.A.

Church Times.—"A notable addition to their excellent 'World's Pulpit Series.' . . . If any one wishes to read a straightforward and uncompromising defence of the citadel of the Catholic position, written so as to be understood of all men, we have yet to find a better book to recommend our readers than Father Adderley's."

Daily News.—"There is much in this volume that arouses controversy. . . . There is honesty, passion and sincerity on every page."

Christian Commonwealth.—"The Rev. James Adderley has made for himself a unique place in the Anglican Church by his ardent sociological advocacy. What that place is may be accurately understood by any reader of this new work. Instead of Christian doctrine of the abstract theological order, we have before us the practical philosophy of kindness, love and philanthropy. Mr. Adderley is one of the most lucid of living exponents of Christian Socialism."

Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt, with portrait. Price 3s. 6d.

THE TEN VIRGINS

AND OTHER SERMONS.

By Rev. H. R. GAMBLE, M.A.

Christian Commonwealth.—"One of the best collections of sermons I have come across for years."

Oxford Chronicle.—"Excellent examples of the best type of the Church of England parish discourse. They are cultured in style and tone, abreast of the newer scientific and critical thought, and have the note of sincere spirituality."

Sheffield Daily Independent.—"Of more than average merit and interest."

Church Times.—"They give just the kind of teaching that an educated congregation requires but does not always get."

S. C. BROWN, LANGHAM & COMPANY, LTD.,

47, Great Russell St., and 78, New Bond St., London.



THE LIBRARY

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

THIS

AVAILABILITY
CIRCULATION
DISPLAY

INTERLIBRARY LOAN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106

576

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 001 003 965 9

